88-2107

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 8 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

LEONARD J. JULIEN,
Petitioner,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE, and JOHN CLET LANDRY; and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

C. EMMETT PUGH
757 St. Charles Avenue, #204
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
(504) 587-0000
and
82 N. Main Street
Suffield, Connecticut 06078
Attorney for Petitioner

Printed by

Brescia's Printing Services, Inc.
66 Connecticut Boulevard
East Hartford, CT 06108
528-4254

IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

October Term 1988

No.

Julien v. Zeringue et al

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari

***ERRATA* SHEET for Petition**

Page 29, line 6,	"this Court" should be -- the CAFC --.
Page 63, FN 58,	"some" should be -- small --.

Printed by

Brescia's Printing Services, Inc.
66 Connecticut Boulevard
East Hartford, CT 06108
528-4254

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- Patent Related Questions -

1. When an invention is held to be a "pioneering" one, does the doctrine of equivalence as established by this Court in Graver[1] and Miller[2] require that a court give consideration to the scope or breadth of equivalence to be accorded to such a pioneering invention in evaluating an infringement of the patent?

2. Is the approach under the judicially defined doctrine of equivalence to be the micro view of "every claim limitation," as espoused by the appeals court, or the macro approach of considering the "device" (as a whole), as stated by this Court in Graver?

---

[1]Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co., 339 U.S. 605, 607; 85 USPQ 328, 330 (1950).

[2]Miller v Eagle Manufacturing Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894).

3. Did the appeals court's premature decision initially holding the appeal to be "frivolous" before the appeal process could be completed, and its subsequent decision reversing itself on reconsideration, with its then primary focus being on maintaining its docket and sanctioning counsel with "a notice to the bar," so cloud its judgment that it caused it not to give the full and adequate attention to the merits of the main, substantive issue on appeal, which this "pioneering" invention deserved?

- "28 USC 1927" Sanction Related Questions -

1. Did the appeals court satisfy the constitutional "due process" requirement[3] in its *sua sponte* sanctioning of counsel under 28 U.S.C. 1927, as interpreted by this Court in Roadway Express[4], when no prior hearing or other opportunity to address the "fact" issues upon which the sanctions were awarded, was ever given to counsel prior to its decision?

2. Did the appeals court in sanctioning counsel apply a proper standard of conduct under 28 U.S.C. 1927 in its ignoring the requirement of some element of "bad faith" or some like egregious act(s), as

---

[3]"No person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...." (U.S. Constitution, Amend. V.)

[4]Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper, 447 U.S. 762, 752 (1980); see also Societe Internationale v. Rogers, 357 U.S. 197, 208-212 (1958), which reversed the dismissal of an action for failure to comply with a pretrial discover order for lack of due process and which likewise did not involve any willful misconduct or bad faith.

implied by this Court and required in most (if not all) of the other circuits, in such matters?

3. Where a counsel is representing an indigent but worthy "pioneering" inventor on effectively a "pro bono" basis -- while he himself also was suffering substantial financial duress and great logistical problems but had no one else to turn to -- was counsel's admitted "burdening the appellate court with 'rag tag' and 'rough edge' performances with hurried work products" sufficient under the circumstances of this case to justify the extraordinary remedy of personal sanctions under 28 U.S.C. 1927?

4. Was it appropriate for the appeals court to sanction counsel for certain specified acts, in which a major part of the criticized acts was a long string of extensions of time, when those extensions were necessitated in the first instance by a delay of a number of months in the court

reporter's preparing and filing the trial transcript and in the second instance by the clerk's office of the district court losing the trial record, including the exhibits the parties wished to refer to in the appeal; while in contrast sanctioned counsel needed less extended time for his direct needs than Zeringue's counsel did in the filing of their respective briefs? Was it an abuse of discretion, as well as a deprivation of due process, for the appeal court not to allow counsel to bring to the court's attention, *inter alia*, these facts before it *sua sponte* sanctioned counsel without a hearing?

5. Was the appeals court clearly erroneous when it "gratuitously" held *sua sponte*, without the benefit of a hearing or other adversative proceeding, that counsel had made a false[5] representation to the

---

[5]Counsel strenuously contests that there was any misrepresentation, as brought out below.

court? Did it compound its error when it used that as a further ground justifying its sanctions under the statute, which supposed misrepresentation was not at all material to the case and was not a cause of any excess fee or increased cost to the opposing parties?

6. Does 28 U.S.C. 1927 allow the awarding of sanctions far in excess of that which could be attributable to the acts criticized by the appeals court or incurred by the parties?

7. Has the appeals court below, in zealously attempting to control its docket, gone too far, establishing a precedent that will have a "chilling" effect on the actions of future legal counsel in general, particularly in "pro bono" cases, especially where the available, otherwise willing counsel themselves are not wealthy?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The caption of the case above contains the names of all the parties. Counsel is not aware of any particular related companies to the one active corporate party, namely, defendant Thomson International, Inc. It is believed that Labadieville Machinery Co., Inc. is no longer in business. Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service is a partnership of Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW i

Patent Related Questions i

Sanction Related Questions iii

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS vii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES xi

CASES xi

CONSTITUTION, STATUTES, RULES, Etc. xiv

APPENDIX LISTING xv

OPINION BELOW 2

JURISDICTION 3

STATUTE INVOLVED 4

STATEMENT of the CASE 5

The Trial Court Proceedings . . . 5

The "Pro Bono" Aspects of the Julien Case 14

The **Patent** Aspects of the Appeals Court's Opinion 25

The Appeals Court Misapplied the Doctrine of Equivalents 25

A "Pioneering" Invention Is Entitled to a Broad Range and Scope of Equivalents 31

The **Sanction** Aspects of the Appeals Court's Order 37

The Appeals Court Failed to Provide Due Process . . 37

There Was No Misrepresentation to the Court . . . 41

Most, If Not All, Appeals Courts, Except the Panel Below, Require Some Type of "Bad Faith" For Any Sanction Under the Statute 50

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 62

CONCLUSION 65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Apex Oil Co. v. Belcher Co. of New York, Inc.
855 F.2d 1009, 1020 (2nd Cir. 1988) 51

Burull v. 1st National Bank of Minneapolis
831 F.2d 788 (8th Cir. 1987) . . . 53

Cimiotti Unhairing Co. v. American Fur Ref. Co.
198 U.S. 399, 414 (1905) 31

Continental Oil Co. v. Cole
434 F.2d 188, 191 (5th Cir. 1981) 32

D.M.I., Inc. v. Deere & Co.
755 F.2d 1570, 225 USPQ 236 (Fed.Cir. 1985) 13, 29

Deepsouth v. Laitram
406 U.S. 518, 173 USPQ 769 (1972) 43

Gaiardo v. Ethyl Corp.
835 F.2d 479 (3rd Cir. 1987) . . . 51

Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.
339 U.S. 605, 607; 85 USPQ 328, 330 (1950) . . . . i, i, 8, 12, 25-27, 30

Hildreth v. Mastoras
257 U.S. 27 (1921) 31

Hughes Aircraft Co., v. United States
717 F.2d 1351, 219 USPQ 473 (Fed.Cir. 1983) 13, 26, 29, 32

In re TCI Ltd.
769 F.2d 441, 447 (7th Cir. 1985) 52

Julien v. Gomez & Andre Tractor Repairs, Inc.
438 F. Supp. 763, 196 USPQ 224 (DC M.LA. 1977), *aff'd.*, 607 F.2d 1004 (5th Cir. 1979); see also 213 USPQ 224 (accounting phase with damage award) 10, 34

Knorr Brake Corp. v. Harbil, Inc.
738 F.2d 223, 227 (7th Cir. 1984) 52

Kori Corp. v. Wilco Marsh Buggies and Draglines, Inc.
No. 79-3636, slip op. (E.D.La., Dec. 11, 1981), aff'd 708 F.2d 151 (5th Cir. 1983) 11

Machine Co. v. Murphy
97 U.S. 120, 125 27

Martin v. Barber
755 F.2d 1564, 225 USPQ 233 (Fed.Cir. 1985) 13, 28

Meyers v M/V Eugenio C
852 F.2d 806, 814 (5th Cir. 1988) 54

Miller v. Eagle Manufacturing Co.
151 U.S. 186 (1894) . . . . i, 25, 31

Morley Sewing Mach. Co. v. Lancaster
129 U.S. 263 (1889) 31

Newman v. Quigg (Commissioner, USPTO)
CAFC appeal No. 88-1312 19

Oliveri v. Thompson
803 F.2d 1265, 1273 (2nd Cir. 1986) 51

Ordower v. Feldman
826 F.2d 1569 (7th Cir. 1987) . . 53

Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc.
833 F.2d 931, 934-35, 4 USPQ2d 1737, 1739-40 (Fed.Cir. 1987) (in banc), *cert. denied*, ___ US ____, 108 S.Ct. 1226 and 1474, 99 L.Ed.2d 426 and 703 (1988) 23, 25, 26, 30

Reliance Ins. Co. v. Sweeney Corp., Maryland
792 F.2d 1137 (D.C.Cir. 1986) 53, 54

Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper
447 U.S. 762, 752 (1980) . . iii, iii, 38, 49, 50

Royal Typewriter Co. v. Remington Rand
168 F.2d 691, 692, 77 USPQ 517, 518)27

Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v. Winters
280 US 30, 42 [3 USPQ 40, 44] . . 27

Sessions v. Romadak
145 U.S. 29 (1892) 31

Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers Local 231
829 F.2d 1370,1378-1379 (6th Cir. 1987) 51

Societe Internationale v. Rogers
357 U.S. 197, 208-212 (1958) . iii, 38

Soules v. Kauaians for Nukolii Campaign Committee
849 F.2d 1176, 1185 (9th Cir. 1988) 53

U.S. Industries, Inc. v. Touche Ross & Co.
854 F.2d 1223 (10th Cir. 1988) . . 53

Vulcan, Inc. v. Fordees Corp.
658 F.2d 1106, 211 USPQ 852 (6th Cir. 1981) 32

Webster v. Sowders
846 F.2d 1032, 1040 (6th Cir. 1988) 52

Weidman Metal Masters Co. v. Glass Master Corp.
623 F.2d 1024, 207 USPQ 101, 103 (5th Cir. 1980) 32

CONSTITUTION, STATUTES, RULES, Etc.:

28 U.S.C. 1254 3

28 U.S.C. 1338 5

28 U.S.C. 1927 iii, iii, iv, vi, 4, 14, 37

28 U.S.C. 2101(c) 3

28 U.S.C. 2201 5

Fed. Cir. R. 30(4) 20

Fed. R. App. P. 28(5)(c) 19

Fed.R.App.P. 38 4

H.R. Conf. Rep. 92-1234, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 8 (1980) 52

U.S. Constitution, Amend. V. . . . iii, 38

U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (USPTO)'s News Release dated March 19, 1989 . . . 63

APPENDIX LISTING:[6]

A - CAFC's Opinion of January 5, 1989 on the Patent Issues (as reported in the United States Patents Quarterly)

B - CAFC's Order of January 5, 1989 re Sanctions (as reported in the United States Patents Quarterly)

C - CAFC's Judgment of January 5, 1989

D - CAFC Clerk's Order of February 7, 1989 Denying Petition for Rehearing

E - CAFC Clerk's Order of February 17, 1989 Declining Suggestion for Re-Hearing *en banc*

F - (1) CAFC's Order of September 6, 1988 Dismissing Appeal for Failure to Prosecute (Not Timely Filing the Appendix), Finding Appeal Frivolous & Awarding Reasonable Attorneys' Fees Against Mr. Julien & His Counsel

F - (2) CAFC's Order of December 7, 1988 Reversing Itself on Reconsideration & Finding That the Appeal Was Not After All "Frivolous".

G - Trial Court's Opinion of November 17, 1986

H - Julien Patent-In-Suit 3,286,858

I - Julien Trial Exhibits PX 10(A) & 10(B)

J - Later Usie Patent 3,865,261 (Joint Trial Exhibit)

K - Julien's Counsel's Affidavit of October 3, 1988

L - Julien's Counsel's Young Associate's Affidavit of September 26, 1988

---

[6]Petitioner is submitting Appen. C-P in a separately bound "Supplemental Appendix."

M - Brochure Entitled "A Creative Idea...A Reality - A Challenge to Youth (1964) [Julien Trial Exhibit & Exhibit Filed with the U.S. Patent Office in Julien Patent Application]

N - Zeringue Defendants' 3 Page Motion to Dismiss Appeal For Failure to Timely File Appendix (09/01/88)

O - Zeringue Defendants' Application for Attorneys' Fees (09/88)

P - Thomson's Application for Attorneys' Fees (09/15/88)

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1989

No.

LEONARD J. JULIEN,
Petitioner,

versus

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY; and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

Leonard J. Julien, Sr., plaintiff-patentee below, petitions for the issuance of a writ of certiorari to review the opinion, order and judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit of January 5, 1989 in the consolidated cases of Leonard Julien

v. Henry Zeringue, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service and John Clet Landry, and Leonard Julien v. Thomson International, Inc., Labadieville Machinery Co., Inc., and Robert Boudreaux (CAFC appeal Nos. 87-1115, -1139).

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit of January 5, 1989, concerning the patent issues, is reported at 864 F.2d 1569, and its accompanying order, imposing sanctions personally against counsel, is reported at 864 F.2d 1572. Copies of them, *inter alia*,[7] are provided in the Appendix (Appen. A & B).

---

[7]A copy of the accompanying Judgment, issued as a mandate on March 29, 1989 (Appen. C), and the subsequent order of February 7, 1989 denying a petition for rehearing and a subsequent order of February 17, 1989 declining a suggestion for rehearing in banc (Appen. D & E) are contained in a separately bound "Supplemental Appendix." It is believed that neither the Judgment nor any of these later orders are officially published.

JURISDICTION

The decision of the court of appeals was issued on January 5, 1989. A petition for rehearing was timely filed and denied by the court of appeals on February 7, 1989 (Appen. D).

The jurisdiction of this Court rests on 28 U.S.C. 1254 and 28 U.S.C. 2101(c) to review the judgment by writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

STATUTE INVOLVED

In an order accompanying its opinion the appeals court *sua sponte*[6] sanctioned counsel under 28 U.S.C. 1927, which provides:

> "**Counsel's liability for excessive costs**
>
> Any attorney or other person admitted to conduct cases in any court of the United States or any Territory thereof who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs,

---

[6]Defendants had moved for attorneys' fees and costs, when the Appendix was filed late, and the Zeringue defendants had urged in their brief that the appeal was "frivolous" and that an award should be made under Fed.R.App.P. 38. However, no one had requested any award for any supposed delay, and no one asserted that the requests for extensions of time were anything but justified, and indeed **none were opposed.** No one requested a sanction under 28 U.S.C. 1927, and no one asserted that counsel personally had made a misrepresentation to the court. The two premature findings of extensive delay and supposed misrepresentation were, it is believed, key to the court's ultimate award. Indeed, it is believed that the court below would not have made such determinations, if it had allowed the required due process to counsel before it *sua sponte* rendered its order in a "notice to the bar."

expenses, and attorneys' fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct." (As amended September 12, 1980, Pub.L. 96-349, § 3, 94 Stat. 1156.)

STATEMENT of the CASE

- The Trial Court Proceedings -

The suit below was for asserted infringement of U.S. Patent 3,286,858 obtained by Mr. Julien on a sugar cane planter that "revolutionized the industry at the time of its inception" (FF. 27). Suit was filed in the Eastern District of Louisiana, which had jurisdiction over the patent suit under 28 U.S.C. 1338 & 2201.

Over two and a half years after trial the district court finally rendered its decision[9] and held[10] the patent to be valid and found the invention to be a "pioneering"

---

[9]Appen. G.

[10]Civil Action Nos. 82-0673 & 83-2267 (Collins, J.; Nov. 17, 1986) [1986 WL 13150; Appen. G].

revolutionary one," but then found that the

"This finding of a "pioneering" invention was well grounded. As the trial court found:

"22. Prior to 1964, the Louisiana sugar cane industry had successfully mechanized all of the agricultural aspects of the sugar cane industry, including the ground preparation, loading, transporting, ground finishing, harvesting, and unloading of the cane. The only area which had not been successfully mechanized was the planting operation, which required a relatively careful metering of cut whole cane stalks, approximately six to eight feet and somewhat crooked along its length, down a line in over-lapped fashion in a furrow in the ground.

"23. Until 1964, the planting of cane had to be done totally by hand or with the assistance of a planter's aid wagon which required hand-labor to move and position the cane from the wagon into the furrow.

"24. For many years prior to 1963, well-funded researchers and workers in the Louisiana sugar cane field attempted to fulfill the long-felt need in the sugar cane industry for a fully mechanized sugar cane planter, but to no avail.

"25. These prior, unsuccessful attempts included substantial efforts by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Sugar Cane League in the mid-50's; LSU's School of Agriculture in the late 1950's and early 1960's; and the engineering divisions of J&L Engineering, Thomson International Co. (*nee* Thomson Machinery) and the Cane Machinery and Equipment Co. (CAMECO), which were the largest cane machinery manufacturing companies in the

(continued...)

patent was **not** infringed under the doctrine of equivalence[12] by the accused machines of defendants.

The detailed findings of fact, which discussed the structure and operation of the machines, were adopted from pre-trial proposed findings submitted **by Mr. Julien**, and

---

[11](...continued)
industry and all established innovators.

"26. Plaintiff, a farmer in Modeste, Louisiana, invented, developed, built, demonstrated and successfully operated the first fully mechanized, successful, practical machine for planting whole Louisiana sugar cane with its crooked length in 1961 through 1964.

"27. His pioneering invention was immediately recognized as the first successful solution to the industry's long standing need for such a machine to replace the inefficient, expensive and generally unavailable hand-labor theretofore required for cane planting. The Julien planter was seen as the final link that was needed for the full mechanization of planting and harvesting of Louisiana sugar cane. Exhibits submitted by Plaintiff convince this Court that the device had indeed revolutionized the industry at the time of its inception." (Appen. G, pp. 5-7.)

[12]This was the sole ground Mr. Julien through counsel maintained that the patent was infringed.

they went into great detail in showing the common principles of means, operation, function and result of the machines and the patented invention[13] (TC's FF 26-29 & 32-42; Appen. G, pp. 6-8 & 9-12). In contrast, the trial court in its subsequent section dealing with the doctrine of equivalence, as a general rule, merely cataloged a series of machinery elements or claim words, which it in turn copied from **defendants'** pre-trial submissions, which concluded that none of the alleged infringing devices included such-and-such "or the equivalent thereof" (TC's FF 48-82; Appen. G, pp. 13-18). In stating these conclusions the trial court gave no separate analysis of means, function or result[14] contrary to the detailed supportive findings the trial court had already

---

[13]Which are the analysis factors to be used under the doctrine of equivalence as established by this Court in Graver.

[14]As effectively required by this Court in Graver.

made and had adopted from **plaintiff**'s submissions.

Finding 56 is exemplary and key to one of the issues at hand:

> "56. None of the alleged infringing devices include **grab**[15] means, or the equivalent thereof."

This is in stark contrast to the trial court's preceding, detailed discussions and fact findings on the structure and operation of defendants "grabs" [a term it particularly used to refer to defendants' cane engaging means at least eight times (FF 33, 34, 37, 38 (twice), 40, 41 & 42)]. For example, in Findings 37 & 33:

> "37. (Defendant) Zeringue, after making the 'V' shaped finger grabs for the Julien planters for one of Mr. Julien's licensees, made cane planters with the so-called 'rake' or 'V' shaped wedge **grabs** substantially identical to those of Gomez & Andre."
>
> "33. In the Julien planter, the variable width grabs were made

---

[15]All emphasis in this and the other findings have been added.

> of opposed, pivoted fingers which were biased toward each other 'with give' through a non-destructive spring bias. The opposed pivoted fingers formed a larger 'V' shape when opened and a smaller 'V' shape when closed. In the Gomez & Andre [Zeringue] planter,[16] the **grabs** were made from the so-called 'rake' structure, which formed a 'V' shape. It had a variable width wedge structure into which the cane was engaged and wedged."

With that background and having called defendants' cane engaging means "grabs" at least eight times, to then find that defendants had no "grab means or its equivalent" was clear error on a most material point.

The trial court also found that the Julien invention was a "pioneering," **revolu-**

---

[16]Andre & Gomez were the subject of a separate, prior suit in the Middle District of Louisiana, in which the substantially identical "grabs" were held to be the equivalent of the Julien grabs within the context of the pioneering Julien invention, and affirmed by the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals (TC's FF 34; Julien v. Gomez & Andre Tractor Repairs, Inc., 438 F. Supp. 763, 196 USPQ 224 (DC M.LA. 1977), *aff'd.*, 607 F.2d 1004 (5th Cir. 1979); see also 213 USPQ 224 (accounting phase with damage award).

tionary one (FF 26, 27 & 29) and, indeed, in one of the relatively few statements in its 24 page opinion that the trial court did not adopt from the parties' submissions or copy from the single previous patent case it had handled,[17] found that:

> "Exhibits submitted by plaintiff convince this Court that [plaintiff's] device had indeed revolutionized the industry at the time of its inception." (FF 29.)

The trial court further held that "(Mr. Julien's) patent is...deserving of **broad** and

---

[17]As stated by the Zeringue defendants in their analysis of the opinion, "In fact, with the exception of the introductory paragraph, FF 30, 31, 45, 85, 86, parts of 27-29, and CL 21-27, the trial court's opinion was constructed by cutting and pasting from the pre-trial submissions of the parties and the trial court's previous opinion in Kori Corp. v. Wilco Marsh Buggies and Draglines, Inc., No. 79-3636, slip op. (E.D.La., Dec. 11, 1981), aff'd 708 F.2d 151 (5th Cir. 1983). (App. 2091-2111) The trial court's FF 30-31 and CL 1-20, 23 were taken essentially unchanged from FF 66-67 and CL 1-20, 23 of Kori with only minor modifications of names, patent numbers and claims." (Brief For Defendants/Cross-Appellants; p. 2.)

primary treatment" (FF 29) and stated the applicable law as follows:

> "(CL) 19. One form of infringement occurs when an accused device incorporates a teaching literally read. An infringement also occurs when a device appropriates a prior invention by incorporating its innovative concept and, albeit with some modifications and change, performs substantially the same function in substantially the same way to achieve substantially the same result. The 'doctrine of equivalents' shields the inventor from such abuse. (Citing authority.)"
>
> "(CL) 20. The determination of equivalency involves an examination of the scope of prior art, the essence or 'heart' of the invention disclosed and the step forward the invention offers. (Citing the same authority.)" (Appen. G, p. 23.)

As noted above, all of the specific detailed discussions and findings concerning the operation, structure and result of the machines and the invention favored a finding of equivalency under these conclusions of law, as well as under this Court's basic decision on the doctrine of equivalence in Graver (1950) and the CAFC's consistent line

of authority interpreting Graver up to around that time (1986).[18]

The mere catalog listing of "such-and--such" and no equivalent, which constitutes a technical conclusion generally without any indicated underpinnings, would not and should not, in counsel's view, stand up on appeal against the contrary, very detailed findings of fact showing the equivalent

---

[18]Note, for example, Martin v. Barber, 755 F.2d 1564, 225 USPQ 233 (Fed.Cir. 1985); D.M.I., Inc. v. Deere & Co., 755 F.2d 1570, 225 USPQ 236 (Fed.Cir. 1985); and, particularly, Hughes Aircraft Co., v. United States, 717 F.2d 1351, 219 USPQ 473 (Fed.Cir. 1983). For example, the latter stated:

> "The failure to apply the doctrine of equivalents to the claimed invention as a whole, and the accompanying demand for 'obvious and [or] exact" equivalents of two elements the presence of which would have effectively produced literal infringement, was error." (Emphasis added; 219 PQ at 482.)

However, as brought out below, the CAFC apparently turned its back on its past precedents and begin taking an approach that cast some doubt on the validity of these precedents.

operation, means and results, in an appeals court experienced in patent matters.

Accordingly, Mr. Julien brought an appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit based on the non-infringement/no-equivalence issue, while the Zeringue defendants cross-appealed the holding of patent validity.

- The "Pro Bono" Aspects of the Julien Case -

In order to fully understand the events which led up to the "sanctions" under 28 U.S.C. 1927, some knowledge of the "behind the scenes" facts of the Julien side of the case is necessary.[19]

Notwithstanding the fact that he was a "pioneer" inventor, deserving of "broad and primary treatment," the manufacturing of defendants' machines **without** the payment of

---

[19]These facts are primarily based on an extensive affidavit (Appen. K) counsel filed in the case, supplemented by an affidavit (Appen. L) of his young associate, who was the staff person assigned to prepare the Appendix for the appeal to the CAFC.

patent licensing fees, caused significant financial damage to Mr. Julien,[20] and with the downturn in Louisiana's agricultural fortunes, Mr. Julien never was able to pay for all of the out-of-pocket expenses of the litigation, much less pay **anything** toward the reduced legal fees counsel had agreed to. As a result, counsel, who in the last several years has become primarily a "one man" operation, had suffered through the trial and into the appeal a loss in billing values and costs in excess of $100,000.00.

This was occurring at a time when the downturn in Louisiana's "oil and gas" economy also caused a number of counsel's previously good paying clients to go into

---

[20]Indeed, as will be shown at any accounting for patent damages, Mr. Julien and his sons with the assistance of the U.S. Small Business Administration built a manufacturing facility on their farm to build the planters themselves, as Zeringue and others, who had worked under license, turned to building the infringing machines. But the infringements did them in before they could recover their manufacturing momentum.

bankruptcy and others to become "slow pay," if not "no pay" clients. All this likewise caused counsel great financial hardship,[21] depriving him of the opportunity of being able to hire others to work on the Julien case on what had become effectively a "pro bono" case.

Additionally, a death in counsel's in-laws in Connecticut made it desirable and his financial challenges made it incumbent for he and his own immediate family to spend most of their time there. While there, counsel works on a near full time basis as a consultant to the Patent Department of a large New England conglomerate.

---

[21]Counsel has not been oblivious to these results, and indeed over the past several years has moved his family to Connecticut to live in his mother-in-law's house after the death of his father-in-law; transferred his children from private schools into public schools; disposed of what once were three cars, leaving a banged-up station wagon with now over 100,000 miles, etc.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, because he had always believed in the merits of Mr. Julien's case and the great moral worthiness of Mr. Julien as an individual,[22] and because counsel knew of no one else[23] who would handle what had effectively become a very expensive "pro bono" case costing in excess of $100,000.00 in value, counsel continued to try his best to help Mr. Julien.[24]

---

[22]One can get a good feel for the kind of person Mr. Julien is by reviewing the brochure entitled "A Creative Idea...A Reality - A Challenge to Youth (1964)" filed with the U.S. Patent Office in the Julien Patent Application and entered as a trial exhibit (Appen. M).

[23]Counsel's young associate in his New Orleans' office, who had law clerked for him for several years, did agree to help out in the logistical end of things on a "pro bono" basis, and he in particular was assigned the task of preparing the Appendix for the appeal. Counsel's other associates had declared that they would no longer handle any more "freebie" work.

[24]This basically now entails counsel generating his work in the back room of his mother-in-law's house, reviewing documents

(continued...)

However, counsel through his young associate assistant, who had agreed to help out on a "pro bono" basis, ran into some difficulties in preparing the Appendix for the appeal. This was due to a number of factors, including - the district court staff losing the trial record and exhibits; the young, new-to-the-bar associate not theretofore being in involved in the Julien case and not being familiar with the exhibits; counsel's records in the Julien case having become disorganized as a result of two or three moves in the office and the file storage areas after the trial; and the absence of counsel from his New Orleans office for approximately ninety percent of this time period.

The parties filed their main briefs and counsel initially did intend to file the

---

[24](...continued)
and "banging away," as now, on his home "office" computer.

optional reply brief, allowed **but not required** under Fed. R. App. P. 28(5)(c).[25]

However, another "pro bono" case[26] before the CAFC intervened. In this additional case, the inventor's unsuccessful trial counsel declined to continue to represent the inventor for the appeal, after the inventor had run out of funds, notwithstanding his having spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in the trial effort. Because this counsel had known the inventor for a number of years, was at least generally familiar with the case, believed the case to have merit with tremendous potential for public good if successful, and believed

---

[25]"The appellant **may** file a brief in reply to the brief of the appellee...." (Emphasis added.)

[26]Newman v. Quigg (Commissioner, USPTO), CAFC appeal No. 88-1312; for background information see In re Newman, 763 F.2d 407, 226 USPQ 97 (Fed.Cir. 1985); In re Newman, 782 F.2d 971 (Fed.Cir. 1986); and Newman v. Quigg, F.2d , 5 USPQ2d 1880 (D.C.D.C. 1988).

that, like Mr. Julien, the inventor would have no reasonable chance of success if left to pursue his appeal alone on a "*pro se*" basis, counsel agreed to and did help him write his briefs and assisted him when he made his oral argument.

However, part of this "Newman" effort took the only time counsel had available to prepare the optional reply brief in this case, and counsel ultimately decided to rely on his main brief and the then upcoming oral argument. But, counsel did fail to realize that the lack of filing the optional reply brief effectively accelerated the time for filing the extensive, many hundred page Appendix, the deadline for which is based on the filing date of the last filed reply brief,[27] which with the reply brief being optional can vary, rather than on a specific, independent deadline.

---

[27]Fed. Cir. R. 30(4).

When the CAFC clerk's office by letter brought to counsel's attention that the Appendix was then past due and needed to be promptly filed, he telephoned his young associate in New Orleans to finish it up, get it out and on file as soon as possible, and the several hundred page Appendix was filed less than three weeks after the notice was received. However, the young associate on counsel's behalf failed to include a motion for the court to accept the filing of the late Appendix, but then he immediately sent out one when this discrepancy was brought to his attention by the clerk's office by telephone.

However, between the two or three work days between the receipt of the Appendix in the clerk's office and the filing of the motion for late acceptance, Zeringue's counsel filed a motion for dismissal due to the late filing of the Appendix. Within a work day of the filing of the Zeringue motion and

without giving the Julien side a chance to oppose the motion and bring out the relevant facts, the appeals court granted the motion. In granting the motion, the court dismissed the appeal just short of a week before the time set for oral argument, and further opined that the appeal was in its view "frivolous"[28] and awarded reasonable, then unspecified attorneys fees to all of the defendant/appellees to be paid jointly by Mr. Julien, the "pioneer" inventor, and his counsel (Appen. F-1). Counsels for appellees then filed documentation requesting awards totaling approximately $65,000.00 (see Appen. O & P), most of which was being requested by the Zeringue defendants.

---

[28]The appeals court has never explained on what ground or through what rationale it found the appeal "frivolous", although it indicated it would give its reasons in a future communication (Appen. F). However, ultimately the appeals court was persuaded by Mr. Julien's petition for reconsideration that indeed the appeal was not "frivolous" and reversed itself.

Julien then filed an extensive 50+ page petition for reconsideration with extensive supporting documentation,[29] somewhat "shooting in the dark" since the appeals court had not given its reasons for finding the appeal supposedly "frivolous." In the petition he brought out the patent infringement merits of his case, discussed the additional, more recent decisions[30] of the CAFC which were published after most of the legal research had been done on the Julien brief, and explained the circumstances surrounding the late filing of the Appendix. Because they were not then in issue, there was no discussion or consideration given by counsel to the various extensions of time or the

---

[29]For which he sought and received short, reasonable extensions of time, totaling 11 days, all of which were unopposed.

[30]Including particularly the Pennwalt decision discussed below and how, even under its divergent holdings, as best they could be understood, the infringement case had merit.

supposed "misrepresentation" to the court discussed below.

On reconsideration (Appen. F-2), the appeals court on December 7th concluded that the appeal was not after all "frivolous" and withdrew its dismissal, indicating that it would go ahead and treat the appeal on the merits, but would do so without oral argument, and denied the Zeringue appellees their requested permission to file a reply brief, which was **un**opposed by Julien.[31]

Then, four weeks later on January 5th the appeals court, perhaps working over the Christmas/New Year's holidays (which consumed some 10 days or so of the 28 days),

---

[31]Julien had hoped that, if a further brief was filed by the defendants, the appeals court would also allow oral argument, so that the appeal could finally get the full consideration it deserved.

issued a somewhat perfunctory[32] decision denying the merits of the appeal.

- The Patent Aspects of the Appeals Court's Opinion -

- The Appeals Court Misapplied the Doctrine of Equivalents -

In considering the merits of the appeal and in particular the doctrine of equivalence, the appeals court opined - "If a **claim limitation** or the substantial equivalent is not present, there can be no infringement", relying on its decision in Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc., 833 F.2d 931, 934-35, 4 USPQ2d 1737, 1739-40 (Fed.Cir. 1987) (in banc), *cert. denied*, ___ US ____, 108 S.Ct. 1226 and 1474, 99 L.Ed.2d 426 and 703 (1988) [emphasis added]; as well as one of its earlier cases.

---

[32]No consideration was given at all to the well established legal principle that a pioneering inventor like Mr. Julien is entitled to a broad range or scope of equivalence under the doctrine of equivalents; see for example this Court's decisions in Graver and Miller, discussed more fully below.

This apparent "micro" word-by-word "claim limitation" approach for the doctrine of equivalence, not even just an "element-by-element" approach, takes the theory beyond any previous "micro" boundary. In contrast this Court's decision in Graver[33], reviewed more fully below, took an over-all, relatively "macro," contextual or "device" (rather than a "claim limitation") approach.

The Pennwalt decision was an in banc, split decision having totally diverging, very strongly expressed views, even disagreeing in the majority view as to whether the CAFC's previous, oft cited decision in Hughes was being set aside. In view of the CAFC's unique role as the **sole** appellate arbiter in patent matters (subject of course to this Court), this divergence is analogous to a "split in the circuits," which only

---

[33]Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co., Inc. v. Linde Air Products, 339 U.S. 605, 607, 85 U.S.P.Q. 328, 330 (1950).

this Court can resolve. Additionally, the majority view in it, like the decision below, is at odds with this Court.

The doctrine of equivalents is best expressed by this Court's teachings in Graver:

> "'To temper unsparing logic and prevent an infringer from stealing the benefit of an invention' (L. Hand in Royal Typewriter Co. v. Remington Rand, 168 F.2d 691, 692, 77 USPQ 517, 518) a patentee may invoke this doctrine to proceed against the producer of a **device** 'if **it** performs substantially the same function in substantially the same way to obtain the same result.' Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v. Winters, 280 US 30, 42 [3 USPQ 40, 44]. The theory on which it is founded is that 'if **two devices** do the same work in substantially the same way, and accomplish substantially the same result, **they** are the same, even though they differ in name, form, or shape.' Machine Co. v. Murphy, 97 U.S. 120, 125." (Emphasis added.)
>
> * * * *
>
> "What constitutes equivalency must be determined against the context of the patent, the prior art, and the particular circumstances of the case. Equivalence, in the patent law, is not the prisoner of a formula and is not an absolute to be considered in a vacuum. It does not require complete identity for every purpose and in every respect. In determining equivalents, things

> equal to the same thing may not be equal to each other and, by the same token, things for most purposes different may sometimes be equivalents. Consideration must be given to the purpose for which an ingredient is used in a patent, the equalities it has when combined with the other ingredients, and the function which it is intended to perform."

Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co., Inc. v. Linde Air Products Co., 339 U.S. 605, 609, 85 USPQ 328, 330-331 (1950).

This Court's doctrine had previously been interpreted by this same Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit as making the "element-by-element" approach (much less its current "claim limitation" approach) erroneous as a matter of law.

As the CAFC had previously stated in Martin v. Barber, 755 F.2d 1564, 225 USPQ 233 (Fed. Cir. 1985), in vacating a summary judgment of non-infringement:

> "To determine whether [the accused device] and the claimed invention are equivalent, the fact finder must decide whether the components of the [accused device], **viewed as a whole**, operate in substantially the same way, and have

> substantially the same function and result, as the claimed invention." (Emphasis added; 225 PQ at 235.)

Similarly, in D.M.I., Inc. v. Deere & Co., 755 F.2d 1570, 225 USPQ 236 (Fed. Cir. 1985), this Court, in reversing another summary judgment of non-infringement, discussed fact issues involved in the application of the doctrine of equivalents, and indicated that the **invention-as-a-whole** approach was appropriate in applying the doctrine, as follow:

> "In applying the doctrine of equivalents, the fact finder must determine the range of equivalents to which the claimed invention is entitled, in light of the prosecution history, the pioneer-non-pioneer status of the invention, and the prior art. It must then be determined whether the **entirety** of the accused device or process is "substantially the same thing, used in substantially the same way, to achieve substantially the same result" as to fall within that range." (Emphasis added; 225 PQ at 239.)

Of like interest and prior clear guidance was the CAFC's earlier decision in Hughes Aircraft Co. v. United States, 717

F.2d 1351, 219 USPQ 473 (Fed. Cir. 1983), wherein a judgment of non-infringement under the equivalents doctrine and the trial court's element-by-element approach was **reversed**, stating:

> "The failure to apply the doctrine of equivalents to the claimed invention **as a whole**, and the accompanying demand for "obvious and [or] exact" equivalents of two elements the presence of which would have effectively produced literal infringement, was error." (Emphasis added; 219 PQ at 482.)

These earlier views of the CAFC were better reasoned and more effectively secured the policy goals expressed in Graver and were correct. The later, relatively "microscopic" views expressed in the case at bar and in Pennwalt were an unfortunate divergence and should be held to be erroneous as a matter of law.[34]

---

[34]Indeed such "microscopic" word-by-word approaches, in which each word or claim limitation or even an individual element is considered outside of the overall context of the invention, inexorably leads a court to "not being able to see the forest for the trees."

- A "Pioneering" Invention Is Entitled to a Broad Range and Scope of Equivalents -

Additionally, as here, if the invention is broad or primary in character, the range of equivalents will be correspondingly broad. Miller v. Eagle Manufacturing Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894).[35] As noted by this Court in Cimiotti Unhairing Co. v. American Fur Ref. Co., 198 U.S. 399, 414 (1905):

> "this record discloses an invention of merit entitled to some range of equivalents...but it is not one of those broad initiative inventions where original thought had been embodied in a practical mechanism, which the courts have been zealous to protect."

Clearly the Julien "pioneering" invention, which "revolutionized the industry at the time of its inception," falls into the latter category, which "the courts [should be] zealous to protect."

---

[35]Note also Hildreth v. Mastoras, 257 U.S. 27 (1921); Sessions v. Romadak, 145 U.S. 29 (1892); Morley Sewing Mach. Co. v. Lancaster, 129 U.S. 263 (1889).

Since Miller it has been consistently established by this Court and the other circuit courts of appeal prior to the creation of the CAFC and indeed thereafter by the CAFC that a "pioneer" patent disclosing a function never before accomplished is entitled to broader protection in the form of a broader scope of equivalence with some liberality than one that makes minor improvements on known technology.[36]

The appeals court, with its attention apparently still focused primarily on its docket considerations and in its quick, perfunctory consideration of the patent merits of the case, totally ignored the issue in its January 5th opinion (Appen. A); while

---

[36] Note, for example, Continental Oil Co. v. Cole, 434 F.2d 188, 191 (5th Cir. 1981); see also, Hughes Aircraft Co. v. United States, 717 F.2d 1351, 219 USPQ 473, 481 (Fed.Cir. 1983); Weidman Metal Masters Co. v. Glass Master Corp., 623 F.2d 1024, 207 USPQ 101, 103 (5th Cir. 1980); and Vulcan, Inc. v. Fordees Corp., 658 F.2d 1106, 211 USPQ 852 (6th Cir. 1981).

the trial court acknowledged the principle and then failed to apply it. Thus, the pioneering inventor, Mr. Julien, still today after 7+ years of exhausting litigation against these defendants, has yet to receive due and proper judicial consideration on the merits of his case under the sole issue he has raised from the beginning, namely, the infringement of his patent rights under this Court's established principle of the doctrine of equivalence.

As a final note with respect to the patent issues as treated by the appeals court,[37] the CAFC, in support of its finding of non-equivalency based on the "claim limitation" approach, on its own and without any reference to any authority, in clear error, stated that "the accused planters used 'V' or 'W' rakes that engage and transport the

---

[37]And a further indication of its "rush to judgment."

cane by stabbing it and raking it down into the trough" (emphasis added).[38]

However, the trial court never found that any such action took place in the accused planters. In fact, the trial court found just the opposite, specifically finding that defendants':

> "grabs were made from the so-called 'rake' structure, which formed a 'V' shape. It has a variable width wedge structure into which the cane was engaged and wedged." (TC's FF 33; emphasis added.)[39]

The trial court consistently termed these elements in defendants' machines as "grabs"

---

[38]The appeals court fell into this error by apparently copying from assertions made in the accused defendants' appeal brief, rather than basing it on what the trial court found.

[39]Although this specific finding was directed to a "Gomez & Andre" planter, which was held to be an infringement under the doctrine of equivalence in an earlier case [Julien v. Gomez & Andre Tractor Repairs, Inc., 438 F. Supp. 763 (M.D. La. 1977, aff'd, 607 F.2d 1004 (5th Cir. 1979)], the trial court further found that defendants' "so-called 'rake' or 'V' shaped grabs (were) substantially identical to those of Gomez & Andre" (TC's FF 37).

(TC's FF 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41 & 42), typically as "'V' shaped wedge grabs" and in essence ridiculed defendants' position by terming them "**so-called** rakes" (FF 33, 34, 37 & 38) or what were "referred to by defendants as 'rakes'" (FF 32) and consistently putting the word "rake" in quotes (FF 33, 34, 35, 37, 38 & 40).

This analogous, equivalent, non-raking,[40] grabbing action occurring in defen-

---

[40]Of course, if defendants' had been interested in a raking action, the "tines" of the so-called "rake" would have been directed against the cane stalks, rather than being positioned parallel to them, as in defendants' machines. The latter results in the cane being wedged into them in a grabbing action rather than being raked.

This action was confirmed in what was originally one of defendants' trial exhibits, namely a patent to a man named Usie, who was apparently the first person to substitute the so-called rake for the pivoting Julien fingers in the patented Julien planter (U.S. Patent 3,825,261; PX 17; Appendix J). As stated in the Usie patent, the planter used a "rake plate...having V-shaped notches for engaging opposite sides of a seed cane stalk for engaging same and moving the stalk along its axis for planting" (Abstract) and "V-notches 41, 42 and 43

(continued...)

dants' machines is succinctly illustrated in plaintiff's comparative trial exhibit 10(A) (Appen. I), with the pivoted Julien "V" finger grabs shown on the left and defendants' "V" shaped wedge grabs (so-called "rakes") shown on the right.

Had the CAFC properly focused on the merits of the case, rather then improperly professionally destroying counsel to send "a notice to the bar" for its docket maintenance purposes, and objectively applied the doctrine of equivalence within the context of the invention as a whole under Graver and further applied the liberality of the broad scope a "pioneering" inventor deserves under Graver and Miller, it would have and should have concluded that the wedging grab action

---

[40](...continued)
define wedges into which are received cane stalks 44. The plate 34 engages the cane stalk immediately behind the eye 45 to slide the stalks 44 rearwardly of the cane cart 14 as shown in Figure 1...." (Col. 2, lines 21-26). This is not a raking or stabbing action.

of the cane in defendants' so-called "rake" plates, which effectively present a variable width "V" shape to the cane to grab it at only one point along the cane's length to pull it off the back of the cane wagon is equivalent to the pivoting, spring biased fingers, which open and close to present a variable width "V" to grasp the cane at only one point along it length to pull it off the cane wagon, as shown in the exemplary embodiment of the Julien patent.

- The Sanction Aspects of the Appeals Court's Order -

- The Appeals Court Failed to Provide Due Process -

Concurrently with its patent opinion the CAFC ordered counsel to personally pay $13,437.00 to the defendants, specifically imposing the sanctions under 28 U.S.C. 1927[4]

---

[4] **Counsel's liability for excessive costs**

Any attorney or other person admitted to conduct cases in any court of the United States or any Territory (continued...)

and also having the expressed purpose of sending "a notice to the bar".[42] It specified the grounds for its imposition, but **never** afforded counsel a hearing on the matter or other opportunity to address the issues **before** it rendered its order, depriving counsel of the requisite due process; Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper et al, 447 U.S. 752, 767 (1980); Societe Internationale v. Rogers, 357 U.S. 197, 208-212 (1958); U.S. Constitution, Amend. V. The appeals court sought to excuse the lack of a hearing

---

[41](...continued)
thereof who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct."
(As amended September 12, 1980, Pub.L. 96-349, § 3, 94 Stat. 1156.)

[42]"The bar is now on notice, however, that failure to comply with this court's rules, including the requirements for preparing and filing briefs, appendices and other papers, may result in the dismissal of an appeal for failure to prosecute." [Appen. B, p. 3 (PQ p. 1556)].

or a rule to show cause by referring to its earlier, non "frivolous" appeal rulings and now vacated reconsideration proceedings, but the issues there were different and the sanctions were based on "facts" not previously considered.

As a result of not allowing comment before issuing its order, it made several clear errors that were an abuse of discretion. It castigated counsel in quite personal terms for a multitude of many months of extensions in what has now become a permanent, highly public legal record (864 F.2d 1572 *et seq.*), but effectively didn't allow counsel to bring to the court's attention that the many months of extensions primarily were necessitated in the first instance by the court reporter's inability to provide the trial transcript, initially because she couldn't find her transcript notes, and thereafter because the district court itself kept her too busy. In the second instance,

several more months were needed primarily because the district court staff lost the trial record and time was sought to allow it to find the records so counsel through his young associate could complete the Appendix.[43]

In fact, counsel for his own needs needed a lesser time extension (a matter of some days) to complete his main brief than was necessary for the Zeringue defendants. Additionally, none of these extensions were opposed nor caused any "excess costs".

Indeed, unlike other cases, where lawyers are in fact guilty of vexatious conduct trying to "run the other side down" or to generate fees for themselves, it was never to counsel's advantage to protract the litigation or to multiply the proceedings, as he

---

[43]They never did find it, and much digging work had to be done to reconstruct the record for the extensive Appendix, requiring the use in some instances of relatively poor copies on which markings and notes appear.

was the attorney without a paying client and was working effectively on a "pro bono" basis. In fact, he was having difficulty trying to keep up with the activities of Zeringue's counsel, who from their own filings had made in excess of $50,000.00 just in the appeal, much less the far greater amounts generated in the many years of litigation at the district court level.

- There Was No Misrepresentation to the Court -

Additionally, the appeals court felt that counsel had made a "misrepresentation" to the court, but such was not the case. The appeals court asserted that counsel made a "false representation" when he told the court that "the Julien case [was] the last piece of significant litigation for which he had any responsibility," because he also had another appeal concurrently proceeding before the same panel, namely the Pan American appeal (Appeal 88-1536). Counsel's state-

ment was made in his extensive affidavit filed in support of the petition for reconsideration in the following context (p. 24, Appen. K):

> "Regardless of the final outcome of the Julien case, which is the last piece of **significant** litigation for which he has any responsibility, he has finished his career in litigation and has no intention of taking on the responsibilities of any further cases, certainly none at the trial level. However, this decision of his has nothing to do with the order of September 6."[4] (Emphasis added.)

It should be recalled that the Julien case has been one entailing extensive trial litigation before a court involving legal expenditure values per side of at least $100,000-$200,000, with an extensive trial at the district court level with many witnesses, including expert witnesses, and concerned a pioneering invention. In contrast, the Pan

---

[4] "In order to spend more time with his family and in connection with his move to Connecticut, counsel has stop taking, and indeed has turned down, new patent infringement litigation assignments.

American matter involved an administrative review from the Trademark Division of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (USPTO) involving a trademark application. In the context of the Julien case, it was not relatively significant in terms of money, time, complexity, or import.

In referring to "**significant** litigation" counsel had in mind the many relatively heavy duty litigation cases he had been involved in over the years, typically involving one or more patent infringement suit(s) before a district court. As he stated in his affidavit:

> "Over the past 20+ years he has handled or been involved in litigation, primarily patent litigation, in the federal courts, in the states of Louisiana, New York, Mississippi, Illinois, California, the District of Columbia, Texas, Missouri, Alabama and Rhode Island, and has successfully handled appeals through the federal appellate route, including the U.S. Supreme Court [Deepsouth v. Laitram 406 U.S. 518, 173 USPQ 769 (1972)], wherein, with the help of others, a 5-4 favorable decision was obtained. In his litigation

> work he has won most and lost very few of his cases." (pp. 2-3, Appen. K)

Although he has stopped being primarily responsible for such litigation, he has continued to do administrative work before the USPTO in matters involving applications or registration for patent or trademark. In the context of the statement, he generally does not consider appeals in such administrative matters, and in particular did not consider the Pan American administrative appeal, to be "**significant** litigation."

Indeed, remembering that both the Julien and the Pan American cases were concurrently before the same court, it would have been at the very least "*non corpus mentis*" to have made any such false representation.

However, the Pan American case does provide a further example of the extremes this appeals court has taken in its position of "If the judicial process is to function

effectively, we must retain the ability to control our docket and dismiss cases where counsel fail to perform their duties." [Appen. B, p. 3 (PQ p. 1556)]. In Pan Am counsel had requested a first extension of time of six weeks to file the brief; no other extensions of time had been previously requested. Counsel was informed of the granting of a much less extension, approximately a week before the brief was due on the shortened extension.

Despite the shortness of time, with extensive efforts, the legal research was done and the drafting of the brief was completed by the deadline, **and a copy of the brief was filed with the Court by the deadline**. However, counsel, after much searching and calling around by him and his wife to a number of printers and law firms in the surrounding areas, was unable to find a printer in his area of Connecticut who could

do the particular binding required by the appeals court for its briefs.

Accordingly, counsel requested in a timely filed motion, which detailed all of the efforts expended to prepare and file the brief and to find a printer with the relatively rare binding capability, an additional few days time to locate such a printer and allow for the filing of the multiple bound copies of the brief. Six days later counsel supplemented the original brief copy, he had previously timely filed, with the properly bound, multiple copies of the brief. However, the motion was denied, because in the order granting the first extension of time, it was stated that no further extensions would be granted.[45] The appeal was then summarily **dismissed**.

---

[45]It is interesting to note that in this case the Zeringue defendants received an additional, unopposed extension of time to file their brief **after** being told in the granting of a previous extension that **no** further extensions would be granted.

It is respectfully submitted that such a harsh, unrelenting policy greatly elevates "form" over "substance", and lacks balance and justice. If a counsel makes substantial, good faith efforts to meet a set deadline, and such efforts were reasonable under the circumstances, but is then kept from being able to fulfil the deadline due to significant, understandable circumstances not under his control or of his making, a further reasonable extension should be granted notwithstanding a previous warning that "no further extensions will be granted."

However, regardless of the merit or lack thereof in the denying of a supplemental six day extension in the Pan Am case, raised by the CAFC in this case to supposedly show a "false representation," the asserted "misrepresentation" was not vexatious to opposing counsel nor did it produce any excess costs.

The court also criticized counsel for failing to file a reply brief.[46] However, as noted above, under the rules such is **optional and discretionary with counsel**, and the lack of doing something discretionary cannot by its very nature be vexatious or cause "excess costs" or attorney fees and indeed could only save costs and fees.

All of these things could have been brought out **prior** to the entry of the

---

[46]The appeals court also stated that "Counsel urges that we suspend him from appearing before the court for two years..." [Appen. B, p. 4 (PQ p. 1557)]; however the only things that counsel truly **urged** in the petition for reconsideration was that the appeal was not "frivolous" but instead had good merit, which should be fully considered in the appeal, and that it would be a gross miscarriage of justice to have Mr. Julien (or counsel) ordered to pay approximately $65,000.00 to the defendants, who had reaped the "fruits" of his invention.

Counsel, somewhat "tongue in cheek", did suggest that as a last alternative he be suspended for a reasonable period of time, comparing such suggestion to B'r Rabbit's classical plea to the fox and the bear to please not throw him in the briar patch, in essence suggesting that not practicing before that panel of the CAFC would be doing counsel a favor.

order,[47] if counsel had only been accorded the constitutional due process required by the law. As this Court stated in Roadway:

> "Like other sanctions, attorney's fees certainly should not be assessed lightly or without fair notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record." (447 U.S. at 767).

Additionally, the court failed to make any finding with respect to any "bad faith"[48]

---

[47]After the appeal court had issued its order and sent its "notice to the bar," counsel did file a petition for reconsideration. Its "post facto" presentation after the bar notice had been sent was denied without comment in an order signed by the clerk (Appen. D). What, if any, substantive "post facto" consideration the appeals court gave to it is unknown. Regardless, its twice exercised tendency to "rush to judgment" in this case and the unjustifiably harsh terms it used in its order and its unjustifiable actions in both the Pan Am case and this case showed the court had lost all judicial objectivity in the matter.

[48]Counsel does not deny that his performance had not been up to the standards he attempts to pursue and which he would have desired, but such was not due to any disregard of the court or of his opposing parties. He through his New Orleans office and fresh-to-the-bar associate did mess up on the preparation and filing of the Appendix. Additionally, the very difficult financial,

(continued...)

on the part of counsel, presumably because the court was of the opinion that such is not required under the statute. However, this creates a split among the circuits that only this Court can resolve.

- Most, If Not All, Appeals Courts, Except the Panel Below, Require Some Type of "Bad Faith" For Any Sanction Under the Statute -

Most, if not all, courts of appeal,[49] except this panel of the CAFC, have required some "bad faith" finding or other like egregious conduct.

---

[48](...continued)
logistical and time problems he had to work under has made a number of his work products hurried, including regrettably the preparation of this petition to this most honorable Court. But he is in fact attempting to do his best.

[49]This Court apparently has not yet fully considered this issue. This Court did state in Roadway that a finding "tantamount to bad faith...would have to precede any sanction under the court's inherent powers" (447 U.S. at 767); see also Justice Blackmun analysis of the Court's holding re §1927 in footnote 1 of his opinion, concurring in part and dissenting in part with the majority opinion (447 U.S. at 768).

2nd Cir. ■ "Imposition of a sanction under Section 1927 requires a "clear showing of bad faith (citing other 2nd Circuit authority)"; Oliveri v. Thompson, 803 F.2d 1265, 1273 (2nd Cir. 1986); see also Apex Oil Co. v. Belcher Co. of New York, Inc., 855 F.2d 1009, 1020 (2nd Cir. 1988).

3rd Cir. ■ "Section 1927 requires a finding of counsel's bad faith as a precondition to the imposition of fees [citing other 3rd Circuit authority]" Gaiardo v. Ethyl Corp., 835 F.2d 479 (3rd Cir. 1987).

6th Cir. ■ *Cf.* Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers Local 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1378-1379 (6th Cir. 1987):

> "More recently, however, we held that the imposition of section 1927 sanctions against counsel 'does not require a finding of recklessness, subjective bad faith, or conscious impropriety; an attorney does not have *carte blanche* to burden the federal courts by pursuing claims that he should know are frivolous.'"

However, in a more recent 6th Circuit decision the court noted:

> "Appeals that are frivolous or are interposed for delay are sanctionable against a party by *this Court* under 28 U.S.C. 1912 and Fed.R.App.P. 38. **More serious** violations of attorney conduct on appeal are sanctionable against the attorney under 28 U.S.C. 1927." (Emphasis added.)

Webster v. Sowders, 846 F.2d 1032, 1040 (6th Cir. 1988).

7th Cir. ■

> "Needler contends that the application of Section 1927 to a case such as this will stultify creativity and dampen the zeal an attorney owes his client. As we emphasized in *Knorr*,[50] courts must be careful not to undercut the orderly development of the law and ethical representation. But the 'bad faith' standard serves this function. Congress believed when it added fees to the list of sanctions under Section 1927 that the enforcement of the traditional bad faith standard would prevent making counsel timorous. See H.R. Conf. Rep. 92-1234, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 8 (1980)."

---

[50]Knorr Brake Corp. v. Harbil, Inc., 738 F.2d 223, 227 (7th Cir. 1984).

In re TCI Ltd., 769 F.2d 441, 447 (7th Cir. 1985); see also Ordower v. Feldman, 826 F.2d 1569 (7th Cir. 1987).

8th Cir. ■ Burull v. 1st National Bank of Minneapolis, 831 F.2d 788 (8th Cir. 1987) (Vexatious or bad faith).

9th Cir. ■ Note Soules v. Kauaians for Nukolii Campaign Committee, 849 F.2d 1176, 1185 (9th Cir. 1988) (bad faith prerequisite).

10th Cir. ■ U.S. Industries, Inc. v. Touche Ross & Co., 854 F.2d 1223 (10th Cir. 1988) (bad faith threshold finding).

Besides the case at hand, the District of Columbia Circuit in Reliance Ins. Co. v. Sweeney Corp., Maryland, 792 F.2d 1137 (D.C.Cir. 1986) takes an approach with a standard other than "bad faith," although not nearly down to the apparent standard of the Julien appeals court. In Reliance the D.C. circuit stated that counsel's "reck-

lessly indifference" to a claim's merits would be sufficient.[51]

Likewise, the Fifth Circuit, in Meyers v M/V Eugenio C, 852 F.2d 806, 814 (5th Cir. 1988), in analyzing the District of Columbia's Circuit's approach in Reliance under Section 1927, stated:

> "Thus, it is not bad faith that establishes frivolity of appeal, but that an unreasonable legal position is advanced without a 'good faith belief that it is justified.'"

However, it is noted that even under the latter, perhaps[52] more diluted approa-

---

[51] "While the language of Section 1927 primarily suggests deliberate misbehavior, subjective bad faith is not necessary; attorneys have been held accountable for decisions that reflect a reckless indifference to the merits of a claim [citing the 7th Circuit's In re TCI, Ltd., *supra*]. We adopt these standards in the case at bar." (Emphasis added; 792 F.2d at 1138.)

[52] It would seem that, assuming a counsel is thinking about what he is doing, a lack of good faith belief is tantamount to being in bad faith; *cf.* Meyers.

ches, Julien's counsel here has done nothing justifying any sanction under the statute.

The "messing" up on the preparation and filing of an Appendix and failing to realize that its indirect deadline had passed, while counsel was relying on a young associate to do what basically was a clerical task, and the need to obtain a number of unopposed few days extensions of time for his needs, while counsel was himself operating in good faith under very difficult circumstances, does **not** justify sanctions under §1927[53], nor indeed

---

[53]Likewise, the award of $12,087.00 to the Zeringue defendants for their filing of a three (3) page motion (Appen. N) to dismiss for the late filing of the Appendix is clearly excessive and not at all representative of the "excess costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct" (28 USC 1927) nor was the $1,350.00 awarded to Thomson actually "incurred."

the inappropriate destruction of counsel's professional standing and career.[54]

Counsel candidly admitted that circumstances beyond his control caused the Julien side to sometime burden the appeals court "with 'ragtag' and 'rough edge' performances with hurried work products", and he sincerely apologized to the appeals court for it. However, when one remembers:

○ that the trial court took over 2 ½ years after the trial to render a decision, which then basically was a cut-and--paste job from the parties' pretrial submissions and his single previous patent case;

---

[54]After many years of litigation work and accomplishment, with a number of them as an "av" rated patent attorney, counsel had previously served as an expert witness, and indeed had been requested to serve as one in a patent trial a few months ago, which counsel had to decline. The holding by an eminent patent court, such as the CAFC, although "half-baked" as here, that counsel had misrepresented something to the court, will no doubt make things professionally impractical, if not impossible, for any such service or litigation work in the future.

- that the trial court acknowledged that a pioneering inventor like Mr. Julien was deserving of broad and primary treatment under the doctrine of equivalence but then failed to apply the principle to the facts at hand;

- that the appeals court within one (1) work day of receiving a motion to dismiss the appeal for the late filing of the appendix, dismissed the appeal without allowing the filing of any opposition and then *sua sponte* held the appeal to be "frivolous" without explanation and awarded attorneys' fees and double costs against Mr. Julien and counsel, potentially totalling over $65,000.00;

- that the appeals court then reversed itself on reconsideration holding that indeed the case was not frivolous and that it would treat the case on its merits, but would not allow any reply brief by the Zeringue defendants or any oral arguments;

and then approximately 15 working days later issued a perfunctory opinion on the patent issues, totally failing to either recognize or apply the broad and liberal treatment due a pioneering inventor under the doctrine of equivalence, and adopting as "fact" an argument urged by the Zeringue defendants as to the "raking" and "stabbing" operation of defendants' "V" shaped wedge grabs, which was directly contrary to the detailed findings of the trial court;

○ that the appeals court then sanctioned counsel without the due process of prior notice or a hearing and issued such a strongly worded order so personally castigating counsel that his professional standing and career have been neigh on to destroyed; and

○ that counsel was blamed and sanctioned for the long time delays due to the court reporter's inability to prepare the trial transcript and due to the district

court's losing the trial record and exhibits, which not only delayed but greatly complicated the preparation of the Appendix;

it would appear that an even greater apology is due at least Mr. Julien, if not all of the parties,[55] from the judicial system. However, of course, counsel is not as concerned with Mr. Julien receiving an apology, as he is with Mr. Julien finally getting the full and complete consideration due his pioneering inventive efforts under this Court's judicially defined doctrine of equivalence.

---

[55]It is at least ironic that the "excess costs and attorneys' fees" caused the parties due to the appeals court's "rushes to judgment" and its "off and on again" handling of the case is truly measurable in the many thousands of dollars, while those due to the justly criticized late filing of the Appendix by counsel's young associate is measurable in a few hundred dollars (*cf.* Zeringue's 3 page motion to dismiss for late filing of appendix; Appen. N).

Certainly counsel would have preferred that Mr. Julien had been, not only a pioneering inventor, but also a wealthy, established businessman who had the resources to do battle the properly financed way, so that help could have been hired or the case could have been referred to someone else to handle. However, in fact he is a poor (in terms of money), black Louisiana farmer that has had to depend solely on this financially strapped lawyer to do battle for him, after his former associates,[56] the defendants, "stole" the fruits of his invention.

---

[56]Defendant, Zeringue's Farm Equipment "made finger type grabs for one of Mr. Julien's licensees" (FF 35; Appen. G, p. 10); defendants "Labadieville Machinery/Robert Boudreaux [was a] licensed manufacturer of the Julien planter" (FF 38; Appen. G, p. 10); "Robert Boudreaux, at Labadieville Machinery, [was] Mr. Julien's primary licensee in the early 1970's through 1975. In their final year of active manufacturing operation, Boudreaux/Labadieville Machinery then sold the parts for approximately seven slat-chain-type planters and thereby provided customers for defendant Thomson during 1977." (FF 41; Appen. G, p. 11.)

It is respectfully believed that this good Court would have a true understanding and feeling of the "real world" aspects of this case, if it would take the trouble to review counsel's affidavit of October 3, 1988 and the brochure concerning the invention, the inventor and his family.[57]

Counsel's efforts, albeit "ragtag, rough edged and hurried", in legitimately trying finally to get a truly deserving client his real day in court, is not deserving of personal sanctions nor professional destruction.

Counsel's logistical problems were many, and counsel's actions have always been founded on the sincere belief that Mr. Julien's case had good merit and should win under this Court's judicially defined doc-

---

[57] accepted as a trial exhibit and filed with the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office in the file of the patent-in-suit (Appen. K & M of the Supplemental Appendix, respectively).

trine of equivalence, when applied in the context of a pioneering invention.

Counsel has given his $100,000.00 plus of "blood" doing his best during difficult times to see that relative "might does not make right." Perhaps it was extraordinary for counsel to hope that the appeals court below would likewise go beyond the normal call of duty to insure justice to a deserving person, but such was not unreasonable.

In summary counsel earnestly believes and certainly hopes that he can persuade this Court on *cert.* that neither the trial court nor the appeals court below properly followed the precedents of this Court; that the CAFC is in conflict with the other courts of appeal on the sanction issues and within itself on the patent issues, and that the CAFC has abused its discretion and has committed clear error.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The need to properly protect a "pio-

neering" inventor, who by definition is rare and affords needed revolution to this country's technology, is clear. This is particularly so now, with the lag in our country's innovative and patentable inventions, as compared to past times, as shown by, for example, the increasing foreign dominance of our patent system.[58]

It has now been 39 years since this Court fully considered its judicially defined doctrine of equivalence in Graver, and this Court needs to resolve the effective conflict among the "circuits" presented by the diverging views of the court below.

The need to promote "pro bono" work among the bar is also well known, and has been a special activity of former Chief Justice Burger, as well as of other, current

---

[58]Foreign nationals now receive nearly half [approximately forty-eight (48%) percent] of all U.S. patents based on 1988 statistics as compared to only a relatively some percent a few years ago; USPTO's News Release dated March 19, 1989.

members of this Court. To restrict such work only to those counsel who are wealthy to insure that they don't, although in good faith, still become afoul of an appeals court, is not appropriate.

The need of a court to protect its docket is understandable, but not at the sacrifice of sound judicial restraint and the needed dispensing of due justice. The court below has swung the pendulum too far, requiring this Court to exercise its supervisory authority.

The precipitous action of the appeals court panel below in "short-circuiting" the appeal by dismissal, when it had everything in hand to allow the appeal to go forward on its merits, and its quickness to find an appeal "frivolous" without allowing counsel to address the issues, like its sanctioning of counsel without due process, can only serve to provide a chilling effect on our legal system.

The court below has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, both with respect to the patent issues as well as to the sanctions, as to clearly call for the exercise of this Court's power of supervision.

Additionally, there effectively are conflicts among the "circuits," on both the patent and the sanction issues, which are purely federal questions that can only be resolved by this Court.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, a writ of certiorari should issue to review the judgment, opinion and order of January 5, 1989 of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in this case.

Respectfully submitted:

C. EMMETT PUGH
Attorney for Petitioner
757 St. Charles Ave.
New Orleans, LA 70130
(504) 587-0000

82 N. Main St.
Suffield, CT
06078

APPENDIX A

CAFC's Opinion of January 5, 1989
on the **Patent** Issues

(as reported in the
United States Patents Quarterly)

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

87-1115, -1139

LEONARD JULIEN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE, and JOHN CLET LANDRY

Defendants/Cross-Appellants,

and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOURDREAUX,

Defendants-Appellees.

C. Emmett Pugh, of New Orleans, Louisiana, submitted for plaintiff-appellant.

E. Richard Zamecki, Browning, Bushman, Zamecki & Anderson, of Houston, Texas, submitted for defendants/cross-appellants. Walter R. Brookhart, Browning, Bushman, Zamecki & Anderson, of Houston, Texas, of counsel.

John M. Coman, Jr., of New Orleans, Louisiana, submitted for defendants-appellees.

Appealed from: United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Judge Collins

---

DECIDED: January 5, 1989

[beginning of Appen. A, p. "1" (PQ p. 1552)]

Before BISSELL, ARCHER and MICHEL, Circuit Judges.

BISSELL, Circuit Judge.

The judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Civil Action Nos. 82-0673, 83-2267 (Collins, J. Nov. 19, 1986), holding Julien's U.S. Patent No. 3,286,858 ('858) not invalid and not infringed, is affirmed-in-part and vacated-in-part. In an order issued concurrently with this opinion we sanction Julien's counsel for his reckless disregard of his duties to this court and award Henry Zeringue, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service and John Clet Landry (collectively Zeringue) and Thomson International, Inc., Labadieville Machinery Co., Inc., and Robert Bourdreaux (collectively Thomson) damages in **[beginning of Appen. A, p. "2"**

(PQ p. 1553)] the nature of attorney fees and expenses incurred on this appeal. Julien v. Zeringue, Nos. 87-1115, -1139 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 5, 1989).

BACKGROUND

Prior to 1964, the Louisiana sugar industry had successfully mechanized almost all of the agricultural aspects of the sugar cane industry, including the ground preparation, loading, transporting, ground finishing, harvesting, and unloading of the cane. Only the planting operation was still accomplished by hand. Although mechanization of the cane planting had been attempted by many well-funded researchers, no one had solved the problem of how to carefully meter out whole cane stalks, approximately 6 to 8 feet long and somewhat irregular in length, and then properly plant in an over-lapped fashion.

Julien, a farmer in Modeste, Louisiana, developed the first fully mechanized practi-

cal planter of whole Louisiana sugar cane and for his efforts received U.S. Patent No. 3,286,858. The Julien patent discloses and claims a planter for whole sugar cane which, unaided by human hands, picks up each cane stalk stacked in the wagon and properly plants it in the furrow. In operation, the cane planter is suspended above and mounted to an open-topped wagon stacked with cane stalks ready for planting. The planter uses a number of staggered parallel moving cane grabs on an endless conveyor to non-destructively grab the top-most stalk and pull it off the back of the wagon into a rear V-shaped trough. As the wagon moves along the ground, the trough guides and positions the cane as it falls down along the centerline of the furrow. Thus, regardless of where the cane is picked up by the cane grabs, the trough guides the falling cane over the center line and into the furrow.

In 1982, Julien filed suit against Zeringue for infringement of the '858 patent and later filed a separate infringement suit against Thomson. After consolidation of the two actions and a bench trial, the district court issued a memorandum opinion (1) holding claims 1-10 of the '858 patent not invalid, (2) finding that none of Zeringue's or Thomson's planters infringed claims 1, 3, 6-9 of the '858 patent, and (3) denying Julien's request for damages, attorney fees, costs, and expenses. Julien v. Zeringue, Civ. Nos. 82-0673, 83-2267 slip op. at 19-24 (E.D. La. Nov. 17, 1986). Final judgment was subsequently entered on November 19, 1986, from which both Julien and Zeringue appeal.

OPINION

1. Infringement

Julien admits that literal infringement is not at issue. In finding no infringement under the doctrine of equivalents, the

district court required the presence of each claim limitation in the accused planters. Julien argues that the district court could ignore claim limitations and merely compare the claimed invention's overall operation and ideology with the accused planters. This argument is without merit.

The district court made extensive findings regarding noninfringement of the accused planters and found that numerous claim limitations were not present in the accused planters. If a claim limitation or its substantial equivalent is not present, there can be no infringement. Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc., 833 F.2d 931, 934-35, 4 USPQ2d 1737, 1739-40 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (in banc), cert. denied, 108 S. Ct. 1226 and 1474 (1988); Lemelson v. United States, 752 F.2d 1538, 1551, 224 USPQ 526, 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Julien also contends that each claim limitation is present in the accused planters and that the district

court's findings to the contrary are clearly erroneous. Julien's contentions are not persuasive.

For example, Claim 1 of the '858 patent calls for

> grab means being adapted to open and close in a direction transverse to said predetermined path, means biassing [sic] said grab means to its closed position, expander means on said sub-frame positioned to temporarily open said grab means at a cane pick-up point near one end of said sub-frame and at a cane release point near the other end of said sub-frame.

'858 patent, column 2. The district court construed this language as calling for the cane grab to open and close in some manner, thereby picking up and transporting the cane stalk from the wagon to the trough. Julien, Civ. No. 82-0673, 83-2267, slip op. at 7-8, 12-16. By contrast, the accused planters use "V" or "W"-shaped rakes that engage and

transport the cane by stabbing it and raking it down into the trough. The district court found that none of the alleged infringing devices included grab means adapted to open and close, or their equivalent. Id., slip op. at 15 (findings of fact 56-64). Julien has failed to convince us that the district court's findings are clearly erroneous. See Great Northern Corp. v. Davis Core & Pad Co., 782 F.2d 159, 166, 228 USPQ 356, 359 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (finding of equivalence is one of fact reviewable under the clearly erroneous standard). Thus, a claim limitation, both **[beginning of Appen. A, p. "3" (PQ p. 1554)]** literally and equivalently, is missing and there can be no infringement. See Pennwalt, 833 F.2d at 935, 4 USPQ2d at 1740; Lemelson, 752 F.2d at 1551, 224 USPQ at 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

II. Validity

Zeringue asserts on cross-appeal that the district court erred in upholding the

validity of the '858 patent. Because we affirm the district court noninfringement finding, we need not reach the validity issue. See Fonar Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson, 821 F.2d 627, 634, 3 USPQ2d 1109, 1114 (Fed. Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 108 S. Ct. 751 (1988).

III. Other Matters

Julien argues on appeal that the district court erred in denying damages, attorney fees, costs, expenses and prejudgment interest. Julien's position is without merit because he failed to prevail on the infringement issue.

Zeringue argues that Julien's appeal is frivolous because it ignores controlling precedent and mistates the law. See Fed. R. App P. 38. Although Julien's counsel has encountered great difficulties preparing and prosecuting this appeal for his client resulting in great inconvenience to Zeringue,

Thomson and this court, we cannot say the appeal was frivolous on the merits.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons the judgment of the district court that claims 1, 3, 6-9 of the '858 patent are not infringed is affirmed. The judgment that Zeringue had not proven claims 1-10 invalid is vacated. All other aspects of the judgment are affirmed.

COSTS

Zeringue and Thomson are awarded costs.

AFFIRMED-IN-PART and VACATED-IN-PART

APPENDIX B

CAFC's Order of January 5, 1989
re **Sanctions**

(as reported in the
United States Patents Quarterly)

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

87-1115, -1139

LEONARD JULIEN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE, and JOHN CLET LANDRY

Defendants/Cross-Appellants,

and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOURDREAUX,

Defendants-Appellees.

C. Emmett Pugh, of New Orleans, Louisiana, submitted for plaintiff-appellant.

E. Richard Zamecki, Browning, Bushman, Zamecki & Anderson, of Houston, Texas, submitted for defendants/cross-appellants. Walter R. Brookhart, Browning, Bushman, Zamecki & Anderson, of Houston, Texas, of counsel.

John M. Coman, Jr., of New Orleans, Louisiana, submitted for defendants-appellees.

Appealed from: United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Judge Collins

---

DECIDED: January 5, 1989

[begin Appen. B, p. "2" (PQ p. 1555)]

Before BISSELL, ARCHER and MICHEL, Circuit Judges.

BISSELL, Circuit Judge.

O R D E R

Initially, this court dismissed the appeal of Leonard Julien (Julien) for failure to prosecute and the cross-appeal of Henry Zeringue, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service and John Clet Landry (collectively Zeringue) as moot. Julien v. Zeringue, Nos. 87-1115, -1139 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 6, 1988) (unpub. order). The September 6 order also directed Julien and his counsel, C. Emmett Pugh, to pay as damages the reasonable attorney fees of Zeringue, and Thomson International, Inc., Labadieville Machinery Co., Inc., and Robert Bourdreaux (collectively Thomson) in this appeal, and double

costs. Julien requested reconsideration of the order, and on December 7, 1988, this court issued an unpublished order vacating the September 6 order and granting Julien's request to dispose of this appeal on the merits. Disposition on the merits occurs in an opinion issued concurrently with this order. See Julien v. Zeringue, Nos. 87-1115, -1139 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 5, 1989). Here we consider counsel's conduct, whether sanctions should be imposed, and the amount of any damages. Because Julien's counsel has demonstrated a reckless disregard for his duties to this court, we impose sanctions against C. Emmett Pugh. We award damages of reasonable attorney fees and expenses to Zeringue and Thomson.

BACKGROUND

Since December 16, 1986, when this appeal was first docketed, Julien has filed no less than 14 motions for extensions of time. Julien has met only one deadline

imposed by the rules and orders of this court.

Julien's appeal brief was originally due on February 14, 1987. On February 2, April 23, and June 1, Julien filed unopposed motions for extensions of time to file his brief. On July 20, 1987, this court informed the parties that Julien's brief was due no later than August 31, 1987. On September 1, one day after the deadline, Julien filed a motion for another extension, until September 8, to file his brief. The court granted the motion. On September 9, Julien submitted his brief accompanied by a motion for leave to file the brief one day out of time. That motion was also granted. Shortly thereafter, Zeringue and Thomson moved to strike Julien's brief and to dismiss the appeal or, in the alternative, to direct Julien to file a corrected brief. Zeringue and Thomson were both experiencing difficulties in preparing their briefs

because of Julien's failure to properly designate material for the joint appendix and to serve a table of appendix page numbers. Julien moved for and was granted an extension of time to respond to the motion. After reviewing the submissions, the court issued an order explaining in detail the proper procedure for preparing a joint appendix. The order directed Julien to serve a table of appendix page numbers and a corrected brief by November 4, 1987, and admonished Julien for not following the court's rules of practice governing the preparation of a joint appendix.

Julien did not meet the November 4 deadline. Instead, he requested and received four additional 30-day extensions of time to file his corrected brief and table of appendix page numbers. When this court granted the last extension, it warned Julien that no further extensions of time would be granted. Julien met this deadline.

Julien's reply brief and the joint appendix were due on May 19, 1988. See Fed. R. App. P. 31. On May 24, Julien moved for an extension of time, until June 6, 1988, to file his reply brief. We granted the motion on June 1, with the warning that no further extensions would be granted. Julien to date has not filed a reply brief.

In the meantime, oral argument had been set for September 8, 1988. Nine days before the scheduled argument and almost three months overdue, the court received, but rejected, Julien's joint appendix because it was delivered without a motion to file out of time. On September 2, 1988, Zeringue filed a motion to dismiss Julien's appeal for failure to timely file a joint appendix. This court granted Zeringue's motion to dismiss and awarded reasonable attorney fees against Julien because the appeal was frivolous under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 38. Julien v. Zeringue, Nos. 87-1115,

-1139 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 6, 1988) (unpub. order).

On September 20, 1988, Julien's counsel filed a motion for additional time to prepare his request for reconsideration. See Fed. Cir. R. 45 (providing that a motion for reconsideration must be filed "within 14 days of receiving the order of dismissal"). Julien was given until September 28, 1988, however, he was warned "[N]o additional extensions will be granted." Julien v. Zeringue, Nos. 87-1115, -1139 (Fed. Cir. Sept 22, 1988) (un-**[beginning of Appen. B, p. "3" (PQ p. 1556)]**pub. order). On September 28 and 29, Julien requested additional one-day and two-day extensions of time. Finally on October 3, 1988, Julien filed a "Petition for Reconsideration." For purposes of this appeal we treat the petition filed as a motion. See Fed. Cir. R. 45 (providing that reconsideration of dismissal is sought by motion). Julien's motion for

reconsideration contained an extensive discussion regarding the merits of the case and why counsel's poor management of this appeal was excusable and should not be sanctioned.

After reviewing Julien's motion for reconsideration, we issued an order providing, inter alia, that (1) Julien could file the joint appendix out of time, (2) Julien's motion for reconsideration of the court's September 6, 1988, dismissal order was granted, (3) the September 6, 1988, order was vacated and the mandate recalled, and (4) the court would consider the merits of the appeal and cross-appeal on the briefs. Julien v. Zeringue, Nos. 87-1115, -1139 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 7, 1988) (unpub. order).

DISCUSSION

I. Failure to Prosecute

The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, as supplemented by the local rules of this court, set forth certain requirements

that litigants are expected to following in pressing appeals before this court. Fed. R. App. P. 1(a), 47; see Kushner v. Winterthur Swiss Ins. Co., 620 F.2d 404, 405 (3d Cir. 1980). We want to make it very clear that our dismissal of Julien's appeal for failure to prosecute, in the first instance, was warranted and within our powers. See Fed. Cir. R. 45; Link v. Wabash R.R., 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962). However, after considering counsel's candid admissions of fault and acknowledging the lack of a published order of this court on dismissal for failure to prosecute, we refrained from dismissing the appeal. The bar is now on notice, however, that failure to comply with this court's rules, including the requirements for preparing and filing briefs, appendices and other papers, may result in dismissal of an appeal for failure to prosecute. Fed. Cir. R. 45; see National Hockey League v. Metropolitan Hockey Club, Inc., 427 U.S. 639

(1976) (affirming a dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37 for failure to respond to interrogatories, notwithstanding the district court's admonitions and numerous extensions); Barber v. American Sec. Bank, 841 F.2d 1159, 1162 (D.C. Cir. 1988) ("Counsel's failure to file his brief on time and his failure to file the proper motions evidence inexcusable disregard for the rules of this court and thus warrant dismissal.")

If the judicial process is to function effectively, we must retain the ability to control our docket and dismiss cases where counsel fail to perform their duties. See Thermocycle Int'l Inc. v. A.F. Hinrichsen Sales Corp., 851 F.2d 339, 341, 7 USPQ2d 1407, 1408 (Fed. Cir. 1988); cf. Landis v. North Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936) (noting that the power to stay proceedings is incidental to a court's inherent power to control its docket). Julien's counsel has repeatedly demonstrated a callous disregard

for his responsibility to meet the time deadlines imposed by his court's rules and orders. Cf. Stotler and Co. v. Able, 837 F.2d 1425, 1427 (7th Cir. 1988) ("Orders fixing the schedule for briefing an appeal must be obeyed if the business of the federal courts is to be conducted with appropriate dispatch, and we take violations of such orders seriously."). Accordingly, dismissal of Julien's appeal for failure to prosecute was warranted and dismissal will be imposed in future appeals under the proper circumstances. See Kushner, 620 F.2d at 407 (dismissing an appeal for failure to file an appendix conforming to local rules); Barber, 841 F.2d at 1162 (dismissing an appeal for appellant's failure to timely file a brief).

II. Sanctions

Julien's counsel concedes that his unprofessional management over the preparation of this appeal resulted in "burdening the appellate court with 'ragtag' and 'rough

edge' performances with hurried work products." We agree and sanction him personally under 28 U.S.C. Section 1927 (1982). Braley v. Campbell, 832 F.2d 1504, 1512 (en banc) (10th Cir. 1987); cf. Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper, 447 U.S. 752, 764-67 (1980) (discussing availability of attorney sanctions under section 1927); see generally Martineau, Frivolous Appeals: The Uncertain Federal Response, 1984 Duke L.J. 845. Section 1927 provides that any attorney "who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct."

However, "[b]efore sanctioning under section 1927, the court" must give the attorney notice and opportunity to be heard. H.R. Rep. No. 1234, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 8, reprinted in 1980 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News

2781, 2783 (dictating that "the court is to afford the attorney all appropriate protections of due process available under the **[beginning of Appen. B, p. "4" (PQ p. 1557)]** law."); see also Roadway Express, 447 U.S. at 767. If the court intends to sanction an attorney sua sponte, due process is satisfied by issuance of an order to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed and by providing an opportunity to respond. Braley, 832 F.2d at 1515. Due process, however, is a flexible concept and the particular procedural safeguards required will vary depending upon all the circumstances. Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471, 481 (1972); Braley, 832 F.2d at 1514.

Here Julien's counsel has received the process due. After receiving the September 6 dismissal order (now vacated), Julien's counsel filed extensive papers with this court providing detailed explanation as to why his conduct in preparing this appeal

should be excused, the appeal reinstated, and the sanctions lifted. Julien's motion for reconsideration was 52 pages in length and was accompanied by numerous affidavits. The motion papers asserted that the appeal was meritorious, and that if anybody was to be punished, it should be counsel and not his client Julien. The penalty suggested in that eventuality was a two-year suspension. We conclude that counsel received sufficient notice that the court was considering sanctions, and was given a subsequent opportunity to respond.

Personal sanctions under section 1927 against an attorney are appropriate for conduct that "viewed objectively, manifests either intentional or reckless disregard of the attorney's duties to the court." Braley, 832 F.2d at 1512. The judicial process has been badly abused by Julien's counsel. For example, he continually missed deadlines, requested at least 10 extensions of

time to file his briefs, and submitted a joint appendix 11 months after he was given extensive and explicit instructions on how to prepare and file a joint appendix. After being warned that no further time extensions would be granted, he missed the deadline for filing Julien's reply brief and joint appendix.

Furthermore, counsel informed this court in an October 3, 1988, affidavit that "the Julien case [was] the last piece of significant litigation for which he had any responsibility." This representation is false, counsel had another appeal (Pan American Life Insurance Co. v. Federated Mutual Insurance Co., No. 88-1536) pending before this court at the same time. On October 5, in Pan American, counsel requested a six-week extension of time to file a brief because he did not realize the brief was already overdue. This court gave counsel until October 21 to file the brief and

then dismissed the appeal for failure to prosecute when he failed to comply. Pan American, No. 88-1536 (Fed. Cir. October 27, 1988) (unpub. order). Counsel's abuse of the judicial process must come to an end. His overall pattern of conduct demonstrates a reckless disregard for his duties to this court. That conduct has unreasonably and vexatiously burdened this court and his opponents.

Counsel urges that we suspend him from appearing before this court for two years rather than assess money damages. For the present we decline to prescribe that penalty. Instead, we impose personally on Julien's counsel a portion of the attorney fees and expenses of Zeringue and Thomson, as damages. We do not impose such sanctions lightly. See Limerick v. Greenwald, 749 F.2d 97, 101-02 (1st Cir. 1984).

III. Excess Fees

After this court dismissed the appeal on September 6 (now vacated), Zeringue and Thomson filed detailed applications for attorney fees and expenses requesting $57,-220 and $6,400, respectively. Julien's counsel filed three responsive papers opposing the fee applications. The total amounts requested by Zeringue and Thomson are inappropriate under section 1927 as a sanction against Julien's counsel. Section 1927 only requires that C. Emmett Pugh pay personally the excess costs, expenses, and attorney fees reasonably incurred on this appeal as a result of his improper conduct. See S & D California Fruit Exchange, Inc. v. Gurino, 783 F.2d 345, 347 (2d Cir. 1986); cf. Roadway Express, 447 U.S. at 756 n.3 (agreeing with lower court that section 1927 provides only for excess costs and not for the total cost of the appeal). Zeringue and Thomson are entitled to reasonable attorney fees for the extra work incurred as a result of

Pugh's abuse of the judicial process. After careful review, we conclude that the amount of such attorney fees is as follows:

Zeringue	$12,087
Thomson	1,350

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. Julien's counsel, C. Emmett Pugh, is sanctioned and directed to personally pay Zeringue and Thomson damages in the nature of the extra attorney fees and expenses they incurred in this appeal.
2. Zeringue is entitled to recover the sum of $12,087.
3. Thomson is entitled to recover the sum of $1,350.

FOR THE COURT

Date

Jean Galloway Bissell
Circuit Judge

(2) 88-2107

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 8 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. _____

In The
Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

LEONARD J. JULIEN,
Petitioner,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE, and JOHN CLET LANDRY; and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX,
Respondents.

ADDITIONAL APPENDIX FOR PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

C. EMMETT PUGH
757 St. Charles Avenue, #204
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
(504) 587-0000
and
82 N. Main Street
Suffield, Connecticut 06078
Attorney for Petitioner

H 1 PM

Printed by
Brescia's Printing Services, Inc.
66 Connecticut Boulevard
East Hartford, CT 06108
528-4254

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This ADDITIONAL APPENDIX contains:[1]

D - CAFC Clerk's Order of February 7, 1989 Denying Petition for Rehearing 1

E - CAFC Clerk's Order of February 17, 1989 Declining Suggestion for Re-Hearing *en banc* 3

and

G - Trial Court's Judgment & Opinion of November 17, 1986 5

Appen. A&B are in the back of the PETITION:

A - CAFC's Opinion of January 5, 1989 on the Patent Issues

B - CAFC's Order of January 5, 1989 re Sanctions

---

[1]Petitioner originally submitted Appen. D & E and G in a separately bound, letter size "Supplemental Appendix," along with Appen. C, F(1)&(2) and H-P. However, the clerk's office ruled that they needed to be submitted in this smaller size format, and hence they are being resubmitted in this form.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR FEDERAL CIRCUIT

87-115, -1139

LEONARD JULIEN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY

Defendants/Cross-Appellants,

and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC. and ROBERT BOURDREAUX,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before BISSELL, ARCHER and MICHEL, Circuit Judges.

O R D E R

A petition for rehearing having been filed in this case,

UPON CONSIDERATION THEREOF, it is

ORDERED that the petition for rehearing be, and same hereby is, denied.

The suggestion for rehearing in banc is under consideration.

FOR THE COURT

February 7, 1989

/s/Francis X. Gindhart
Francis X. Gindhart
Clerk

cc: C. Emmett Pugh
E. Richard Zamecki
John M. Coman, Jr.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR FEDERAL CIRCUIT

87-115, -1139

LEONARD JULIEN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY

Defendants/Cross-Appellants,

and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC. and ROBERT BOURDREAUX,

Defendants-Appellees.

O R D E R

A suggestion for rehearing in banc having been filed in this case,

UPON CONSIDERATION THEREOF, it is

ORDERED that the suggestion for rehearing in banc be, and the same hereby is declined.

FOR THE COURT

February 17, 1989 /s/Francis X. Gindhart
Francis X. Gindhart
Clerk

cc: C. Emmett Pugh
E. Richard Zamecki
John M. Coman, Jr.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

LEONARD J. JULIEN	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	NO. 82-0673
ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE, HENRY ZERINGUE and JOHN CLET LANDRY	SECTION "C"
LEONARD J. JULIEN	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	NO. 83-2267
THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC. and ROBERT BOUDREAUX	SECTION "C"

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

JUDGMENT

In accordance with the Opinion of this Court signed on November 10, 1986,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that there be JUDGMENT in favor of defendants, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue, John Clet Landry, Thompson International, Inc. and Robert Boudreaux, and against plaintiff, Leonard J. Julien.

This action is dismissed with prejudice, all parties to bear their respective costs.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that there be JUDGMENT in favor of plaintiff, Leonard J. Julien, and against defendants, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry, on the issue of the counterclaim.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this the 18th day of November, 1986.

_____

LORETTA G. WHYTE,
CLERK OF COURT

BY: _____
Denny P. Descent
Chief Deputy Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

LEONARD J. JULIEN	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	NO. 82-0673
ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE, HENRY ZERINGUE and JOHN CLET LANDRY	SECTION "C"
LEONARD J. JULIEN	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	NO. 83-2267
THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC. and ROBERT BOUDREAUX	SECTION "C"

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This case was tried before the Court, sitting without a jury, and was taken under submission. After careful consideration of the evidence presented at trial, counsel's arguments, submitted memoranda and the relevant facts and applicable law, the Court hereby makes the following FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, pursuant to the provisions of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 52.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Claims

1. This is an action by Leonard J. Julien against Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry for infringement of Claims 1, 3, and 6-9 of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858 entitled "Cane Planter." Plaintiff's complaint seeks judgment for treble damages and interest, together with attorney's fees, costs, and all other equitable relief.[1]

2. The counterclaim by Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry against Leonard Julien prays for a declaratory judgment that Claims 1-10 of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858 be considered invalid as anticipated and obvious over the prior art, invalid and unenforceable as fraudulently obtained,

---

[1]Plaintiff has dismissed his claim for injunctive relief due to the expiration of the patent in suit on January 6, 1983.

unenforceable under the principles of laches and equitable estoppel, and not infringed by any act of the counterclaim.

3. Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry also seek to have this case declared "exceptional," and to be awarded attorney fees and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and excess costs, expenses and attorney fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. They argue that Leonard Julien maintained this suit without a "good faith" belief in the validity, enforceability or infringement of the patent.

The Parties

4. Leonard J. Julien, Sr., is the inventor named in the patent suit.

5. Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service is an unincorporated partnership owned by Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry. Its principal place of business is located in

this district in St. James Parish, Louisiana, at which it has allegedly committed acts of infringement.

6. Defendants, Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry, are general partners in Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service and are residents of this district.

7. No privity exists or has ever existed between Gomez & Andre Tractor Repairs, Inc. and Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue or John Clet Landry with respect to any device which was or may have been the subject matter of Julien v. Gomez & Andrew Tractor Repairs, Inc., 438 F. Supp. 763 (M.D. La. 1977), or the present action.

The Patent in Suit

8. United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858 was issued on November 22, 1966 in the name of Leonard J. Julien and is directed to a sugar cane planter.

9. From May 20, 1965 until January 6, 1983, United States Letters Patent No. 8,286,858 and the application from which it matured was jointly owned by Leonard Julien and the law firm of Polack, Rosenberg, Rittenberg & Endom or its predecessors in interest.[2]

10. The invention of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858 is directed to a device for planting sugar cane that employs several overhead conveyors positioned above a cane cart.

11. The patent contains ten claims. Claim 1 is directed to cane planting machinery for cooperation with a cane wagon, said machinery comprising

> "a portably mounted main frame, an elongated sub-frame suspended from the main frame, means for connecting the main frame to the wagon in a position in which at least one end of the sub-frame is suspended over the wagon and

---

[2]The law firm owned a 15% interest in the patent which was later reassigned to plaintiff Julien.

is constrained to travel therewith, means for raising and lowering the sub-frame relative to the main frame, at least one flexible endless carrier means mounted on the sub-frame to travel in a predetermined path relative thereto, means for driving the endless carrier means; grab means adapted to open and close in a direction transverse to the predetermined path and carried by and spaced longitudinally along the endless carrier means; means for biassing the grab means to their closed position; expander means on the sub-frame positioned to temporarily open the grab means at a cane pick-up point near one end of the sub-frame and at a cane release point near the other end of the sub-frame, and upwardly open trough means positioned beneath the release point to receive cane released by the grab means and to guide it into a predetermined position relative to the path of travel of the wagon."

12. Claims 2-10 include all of the features of Claim 1 and are drawn to more specific features.

13. Claim 2 additionally specifically requires a telescoping means to connect the main frame and the elongated sub-frame of Claim 1.

14. Claim 3 specifically requires a particular construction and placement of the trough means of Claim 1.

15. Claim 4 specifically requires a particular construction of the grab means, biasing means and expander means of Claim 1.

16. Claim 5 specifically requires the grab means of Claim 4 to include spikes on the outer ends to engage the cane.

17. Claim 6 specifically requires a plurality of the flexible, endless carrier means and expander means of Claim 1.

18. Claim 7 specifically requires a particular configuration of the grab means of Claim 6.

19. Claim 8 specifically requires a particular configuration and placement of the elongated sub-frame, the plurality of flexible, endless carrier means and the trough means of Claim 6.

20. Claim 9 specifically requires a particular power source for the driving means of Claim 1.

21. Claim 10 requires independent vehicular means, specifically a tractor, which partially supports the main frame of Claim 1 and which carries and is driven by the power source of Claim 9.

Background on the Development of the Cane Planter

22. Prior to 1964, the Louisiana sugar cane industry had successfully mechanized all of the agricultural aspects of the sugar cane industry, including the ground preparation, loading, transporting, ground finishing, harvesting, and unloading of the cane. The only area which had not been successfully mechanized was the planting operation, which required a relatively careful metering of cut whole cane stalks, approximately six to eight feet and somewhat crooked along its

length, down a line in over-lapped fashion in a furrow in the ground.

23. Until 1964, the planting of cane had to be done totally by hand or with the assistance of a planter's aid wagon which required hand-labor to move and position the cane from the wagon into the furrow.

24. For many years prior to 1963, well-funded researchers and workers in the Louisiana sugar cane field attempted to fulfill the long-felt need in the sugar cane industry for a fully mechanized sugar cane planter, but to no avail.

25. These prior, unsuccessful attempts included substantial efforts by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Sugar Cane League in the mid-50's; LSU's School of Agriculture in the late 1950's and early 1960's; and the engineering divisions of J&L Engineering, Thomson International Co. (nee Thomson Machinery) and the Cane Machinery and Equipment Co. (CAMECO),

which were the largest cane machinery manufacturing companies in the industry and all established innovators.

26. Plaintiff, a farmer in Modeste, Louisiana, invented, developed, built, demonstrated and successfully operated the first fully mechanized, successful, practical machine for planting whole Louisiana sugar cane with its crooked length in 1961 through 1964.

27. His pioneering invention was immediately recognized as the first successful solution to the industry's long standing need for such a machine to replace the inefficient, expensive and generally unavailable hand-labor theretofore required for cane planting. The Julien planter was seen as the final link that was needed for the full mechanization of planting and harvesting of Louisiana sugar cane. Exhibits submitted by plaintiff convince this Court that the device had indeed revolution-

ized the industry at the time of its inception.

28. In 1964, Julien applied for a patent and received U.S. Patent 3,286,858 on November 22, 1966 for his invention. This gave him the exclusive rights on his invention for 17 years.

29. As noted in Claims 1, 3 and 6-9 (P-4 & 4E) read in the light of the specification (P-1), the Julien patent covers a planter for whole cane which uses one or more variable width, staggered parallel moving cane grabs on an "endless" conveyor or carrier. The grabs cyclically and non-destructively engage cane from their top where they are loaded longitudinally in a moving open wagon-like vehicle transported by a tractor or other suitable motorized vehicle. The cane grabs sequentially engage the top-most cane of the load that is stacked across the width of the wagon, non-destructively grab it at a single point

along its length, and pull it off the back of the wagon down into a rear V-shape trough or guide. The trough system on the end of the wagon-like vehicle guides and positions the cane falling under the force of gravity longitudinally down along the center-line of the furrow, as the planter moves along over the furrow. Thus, regardless of where the cane may have been loaded in the wagon or where it is picked up by the cane grabs, the trough guide system guides the falling cane over to the center line and into the furrow. As the cane is depleted, the grabs and the cane are moved toward each other. The Julien patent was successful in accomplishing its unique objectives, and at the time proved to be a commercial success. Plaintiff's patent is valid and is deserving of broad and primary treatment.

30. Defendants have attempted to establish the existence of a prior art for the entire patent and/or the various ele-

ments or parts of the Julien Patent No. 3,286,858: United States Patent No. 2,213,774 to Frank E. Taylor (disclosing a transfer device including an elongated sub-frame); United States Patent to Turner No. 2,411, 348 (discloses apparatus which includes an elongated sub-frame); United States Patent to Barchoff No. 2,705,659, Ramp No. 3,286,858, Arceneaux No. 2,841,103, Anderson No. 2,840,269, Hulett No. 2,617,556, Estevez No. 1,764,159, Kassebeer No. 1,678,643, Stephenson No. 1,280,895, Lojacono No. 1,000,529, Roop No. 662,135, Aguiar No. 552,449, O'Bourke No. 454,758, Holmes No. 347,800, Cortes No. 60,620 (disclosing a portably mounted sugar cane planter); and the sugar cane planter of Mansel M. Mayeaux described and illustrated in Defendant's Exhibits 48, 68-88 and 205-207.

31. Defendants failed to establish any prior art which discloses all, or substan-

tially all, of the elements claimed under the Julien 3,286,858 Patent.

Infringement

32. In order to obtain a part of the cane planter market, some unlicensed manufacturers of sugar cane planters began to arise. One of them, Gomez & Andrew Tractor Repairs, Inc., began making a sugar cane planter very similar to that of the then current Julien planter but with a modified, V-shaped, variable width, wedge cane grabs (referred to by defendants as "rakes."

33. In the Julien planter, the variable width grabs were made of opposed, pivoted fingers which were biased toward each other "with give" through a non-destructive spring bias. The opposed pivoted fingers formed a larger "V" shape when opened and a smaller "V" shape when closed. In the Gomez & Andre planter, the grabs were made from the so-called "rake" structure,

which formed a "V" shape. It had a variable width wedge structure into which the cane was engaged and wedged.

34. Plaintiff filed a patent infringement suit against Gomez & Andre in the Middle District of Louisiana on August 20, 1976. The parties stipulated that defendant Gomez' planter was the same as plaintiff's in every material respect expect for the grab device. In view of the pioneering nature of the Julien invention, the Court held that the Julien patent was entitled to broad coverage, and the Gomez & Andre planter (and in particular the so-called "rake" cane grab) was held to be equivalent to the Julien patent and therefore an infringement. 438 F. Supp. 763 (M.D. La. 1977), aff'd, 607 F.2d 1004 (5th Cir. 1979).

35. Defendant, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, has had some involvement in sugar cane planters. It made finger type grabs for one of Mr. Julien's licensees and

thereafter worked on a cane planter which had "rakes." It also has had some involvement in rotary drum type planters.

36. For a period of time, defendant, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, collected money from some of its customers involving sugar cane planters for possible patent claims.

37. Zeringue, after making the "V" shaped finger grabs for the Julien planters for one of Mr. Julien's licensees, made cane planters with the so-called "rake" or "V" shaped wedge grabs substantially identical to those of Gomez & Andre.

38. Labadieville Machinery/Robert Boudreaux, a licensed manufacturer of the Julien planter, substituted these so-called "rake" elements or "V" shaped wedge grabs in place of the "V" fingers of the original Julien design, and paid royalties to Mr. Julien for the machines which incorporated these "V" shaped wedge substitutions.

Similarly, plaintiff asserts that Zeringue charged patent royalties to his customers for his "Gomez & Andre" type planters with the "V" shaped wedge or "rake" cane grabs. However, no royalties were paid to Mr. Julien or to anyone else, but were retained as extra, unearned "profits."

39. Thereafter, plaintiff argues, the unlicensed manufacturers, including defendants Zeringue and Thomson, made a further, secondary modification to the cane planters.

40. In the Julien planter, the cane grabs were mounted on the peripheral surface of an "endless" conveyor made from chains mounted on rotating, circular sprockets, which caused the cane grabs to be rotated round and around in a cyclical, circular fashion. In the further modified unlicensed planters, slats made of angle iron were placed across the chains to serve as an endless carrier for the "rake" V-shape wedge grabs.

41. This slat-type chain conveyor or carrier for the cane grabs was initially made on or about 1976 by defendant, Robert Boudreaux, at Labadieville Machinery, Mr. Julien's primary licensee in the early 1970's through 1975. In their final year of active manufacturing operation, Boudreaux/Labadieville Machinery then sold the parts for approximately seven slat-chain-type planters and thereby provided customers for defendant Thomson during 1977. This transaction, plaintiff asserts, began defendant Thomson's infringement activities.

42. A rotating, circular metal drum was substituted for the slat/chain/sprocket arrangement as the "endless" conveyor for the peripherally supported cane grabs, which likewise caused the cane grabs to be rotated round and around in a cyclical, circular fashion. This form of the planter is called the "rotary drum" planter.

43. In the context of the pioneering Julien patent, the rotary drum, like the so-called "rake" of the Gomez & Andrew case, plaintiff argues, is an equivalent, infringing substitution of one equivalent mechanical part for another.

44. Thus, upon the completion of the Gomez & Andre litigation, suit for patent infringement was brought against defendants, Zeringue and Thomson.

File Wrapper Estoppel

45. Defendants have raised the doctrine of "file wrapper estoppel" as a defense to plaintiff's claim of equivalency. This doctrine prevents a patentee from reclaiming through the doctrine of equivalents that which was voluntarily surrendered by the narrowing of the language of the patent claims in order to avoid prior art cited by the Patent Office, Continental Oil

Co. v. V. Cole, 634 F.2d 188 (5th Cir. 1981).

46. The file wrapper estoppel arising due to the amendment and attorney arguments filed on June 16, 1966 limits all of the claim to cane planting machinery including "a portably mounted" main frame with "means for connecting said main frame to said vehicle in a position in which at least one end of said sub-frame is suspended over said vehicle and is constrained to travel therewith," and wherein the main frame is portably mounted separate and apart from the cane wagon in order to permit easy substitution of one wagon for another with a single planting machine.

47. The file wrapper estoppel arising due to the amendment and attorney arguments filed on June 16, 1966 limits the claims to cane planting machinery including "an elongated" sub-frame having expander means thereon to "temporarily" open the grab means

"at a cane pick-up point near one end of the sub-frame and at a cane release point near the other end of the sub-frame," or the equivalent thereof. (Defendants' Exhibit 97-99)

48. None of the alleged infringing devices includes a portably mounted main frame or the equivalent thereof. In fact, the cane planting equipment is clearly an integral part of the cane wagon in the case of each of the device alleged herein to infringe plaintiff's Patent No. 3,286,858.

49. None of the alleged infringing devices includes means for connecting a main frame to a cane wagon in a position in which at least one end of a sub-frame is suspended over the cane wagon is constrained to travel therewith in the releasable fashion required by the file wrapper arguments set forth in the amendment filed on June 16, 1966, or the equivalent thereof.

50. None of the alleged infringing devices is used in cooperation with a separate open-topped vehicle, or the equivalent thereof.

51. None of the alleged infringing devices include a sub-frame that is elongated, or the equivalent thereof.

52. None of the alleged infringing devices include a sub-frame "suspended from" a main frame, or the equivalent thereof.

53. None of the alleged infringing devices include a means for raising and lowering a sub-frame relative to a main frame, or the equivalent thereof.

54. None of the alleged infringing devices include a sub-frame which can be raised and lowered relative to a main frame as defined in Claim 1 of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858 (D-10), or the equivalent of such a sub-frame.

55. None of the alleged infringing devices include a flexible endless carrier

means mounted on a sub-frame to travel in a predetermined path relative thereto, or the equivalent thereof.

56. None of the alleged infringing devices include grab means, or the equivalent thereof.

57. None of the alleged infringing devices include biasing means, or the equivalent thereof.

58. None of the alleged infringing devices include expander means, or the equivalent thereof.

59. None of the alleged infringing devices include grab means, or means for grabbing, carried by and spaced longitudinally along a flexible, endless carrier means, or the equivalent thereof.

60. None of the alleged infringing devices include grab means, or means for grabbing, adapted to open and close in a direction transverse to the path of travel

of a flexible, endless carrier means, or the equivalent thereof.

61. None of the alleged infringing devices include expander means, or means for expanding, positioned to "temporarily open" a grab means at a cane "pick-up point" near one end of a sub-frame and at a cane "release point" near the other end of the sub-frame and located "on the sub-frame," or the equivalent thereof.

62. None of the alleged infringing devices include an elongated sub-frame having expander means thereon to temporarily open grab means at a cane pick=up point near one end of the sub-frame and at a cane release point near the other end of the sub-frame, or the equivalent thereof.

63. None of the alleged infringing devices include a cane release point near one end of a sub-frame, or the equivalent of such a point.

64. None of the alleged infringing devices operate by, or include apparatus for, either grabbing cane, or picking up and releasing cane, or the equivalent of such operations or apparatus.

65. None of the alleged infringing devices include upwardly open trough means, or the equivalent thereof.

66. None of the alleged infringing devices include upwardly open trough means positioned beneath a release point to receiving cane released by a grab means and guide the cane into a predetermined position relative to the path of travel of a wagon, or the equivalent thereof.

67. None of the alleged infringing devices include telescoping means for guiding a sub-frame as it is raised and lowered relative to a main frame, or the equivalent thereof.

68. None of the alleged infringing devices include a sub-frame as defined in

Claim 1 adapted to be mounted above a wagon with one end of the sub-frame projecting beyond the rear end of the wagon, or the equivalent thereof.

69. None of the alleged infringing devices include grab means comprising a pair of arms extending generally outward away from said carrier means, or the equivalent thereof.

70. None of the alleged infringing devices include cam surfaces, or the equivalent thereof.

71. None of the alleged infringing devices include expander means on said sub-frame comprising cam surfaces positioned to enter between the inner ends of grab means and "drive them progressively apart" for separating the outer ends, as the grab means passes by the expander means, or the equivalent thereof.

72. None of the alleged infringing devices include spikes on arms, or the equivalent thereof.

73. None of the alleged infringing devices include spikes carried by the outer ends of said grab means to engage the cane, or the equivalent thereof.

74. None of the alleged infringing devices include a "plurality" of "flexible," parallel, endless carrier means, or the equivalent thereof.

75. None of the alleged infringing devices include a "plurality" of parallel, flexible, endless carrier means and separate expander means for each carrier means, or the equivalent thereof.

76. None of the alleged infringing devices include a "plurality" of parallel, flexible, endless carrier means with grab means on each carrier means, or the equivalent thereof.

77. None of the alleged infringing devices include the required sub-frame adapted to be mounted above a wagon with one end of the sub-frame projecting beyond the rear end of the wagon, or the equivalent thereof.

78. None of the alleged infringing devices include a plurality of parallel, flexible, endless carrier means mounted on the same sub-frame, or the equivalent thereof.

79. None of the alleged infringing devices include upwardly open trough means extending laterally beneath a plurality of parallel, flexible, endless carrier means, thereby defining a guide for directing cane delivered by any of the endless carrier means into a single line, or the equivalent thereof.

80. None of the alleged infringing devices include means for driving a flexible, endless carrier means and which com-

prises a power source independent of the wheels of an open-topped vehicle, or wagon, or the equivalent thereof.

81. None of the alleged infringing devices comprise vehicular means which is independent of the open-topped vehicle, or wagon, and at least partially supports the portably mounted main frame and in which the power source is mounted on and drives the independent vehicular means, or the equivalent thereof.

82. None of the alleged infringing devices allegedly made, sold or used by or on behalf of Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue or John Clet Landry include each and every element or its equivalent of any claim of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858.

83. Neither Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service nor Henry Zeringue nor John Clet Landry has ever induced another to infringe or contributed to the infringement by anoth-

er of any claim of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858.

84. Neither Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service nor Henry Zeringue nor John Clet Landry has ever reconstructed any device which infringes any claim of United States Letters Patent No. 3,286,858.

85. Defendants' structures are not equivalent to plaintiff's cane planter of Claims 1 through 10.

86. To the extent that these Findings of Fact also constitute Conclusions of Law, they are specifically adopted as both Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This is a patent suit brought under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et. seq. (hereinafter the Patent Act). This Court has jurisdiction of the parties and of the subject matter of this action by virtue of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338, 2201. There is an actual

controversy between the parties concerning the subject matter of this action, 28 U.S.C. § 2201. Venue is proper as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

2. Plaintiff has the burden of proof to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendants' manufacture, use and/or sale of cane planters have infringed any one of the claims of the Julien '858 patent. Moore v. Shultz, 491 F.2d 294, 298 (10th Cir. 1974), cert. denied, 419 U.S. 930 (1974).

3. The Julien '858 patent is presumed valid. The burden of establishing invalidity of the patent or any claim thereof rests with the defendants. Radio Corp. of America v. Radio Engineering Lab., Inc., 293 U.S. 1, 7 (1934); Continental Oil Company v. Cole, 634 F.2d 188, 195 (5th Cir. 1981); Ingersoll-Rand Co. v. Brunner & Lay, Inc., 474 F.2d 491 (5th Cir. 1973); Van Corp Manufacturing, Inc. v. Townley Industrial Plastics,

Inc., 464 F.2d 16, 17 (5th Cir. 1972), and it must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. Kori Corp. v. Wilco Marsh Buggies & Draglines, Inc., 561 F. Supp. 512 (E.D. La. 1981), aff'd, Kori Corp. v. Wilco Marsh Buggies & Draglines, Inc., 708 F.2d 151 (5th Cir. 1983); Julien v. Gomez & Andre Tractor Repairs, Inc., 438 F. Supp. 763 (M.D. La. 1977).

4. The defendants bear a heavy burden of proof to establish the invalidity or unenforceability of the Julien '858 patent. The courts have variously recognized this burden to be akin to the fraud standard of clear and convincing evidence an to the criminal law standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, but, at a minimum, greater than a mere preponderance of the evidence. Ingersoll-Rand Co. v. Brunner & Lay, Inc., 474 F.2d 491, 496 (5th Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 414 U.S. 865 (1973) (citing Hobbs v. United States Atomic Energy Commission, 451

F.2d 849 (5th Cir. 1971); Stamicarbon N.V. v. Escambia Chemical Corporation, 430 F.2d 920 (5th Cir. 1970), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 944 (1970).

5. The Patent Act sets forth three conditions of patentability: novelty, utility and non-obviousness. 35 U.S.C. §§ 101-103.

6. The Julien '858 patent satisfied the separate tests of novelty, utility and non-obviousness and is valid. United States v. Adams, 383 U.S. 39, 48 (1966); Gaddis v. Calgon Corp., 506 F.2d 880, 884 (5th Cir. 1975).

7. An invention is patentable provided the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would not have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject pertains. 35 U.S.C. § 103; Sakraida v. Ag Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273,

2880 (1976); Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966); Continental Oil Company v. Cole, 634 F.2d at 195-196.

8. The test of non-obviousness is not whether the individual elements were obvious at the time of the invention, but whether the combination as a whole produces a new and different result which was not obvious. U.S. v. Adams, 383 U.S. at 714-715; Continental Oil Company v. Cole, 634 F.2d at 197.

9. A combination of elements and parts may result in an effect greater than the sum of the several effects taken separately. Such a synergistic result is strong if not conclusive evidence of non-obviousness. Van Corp. Manufacturing, Inc. v. Townley Industrial Plastics, Inc., 464 F.2d at 20.

10. The subject matter as a whole, of the invention defined in Claims 1 through 9 of the Julien '858 patent, would not have been obvious at the time the invention was

made to one having ordinary skill in the art of cane planting.

11. Claims 1 through 9 of the Julien '858 patent express the novel concepts constituting the invention, and such concepts are set forth in terms of a combination of elements and their cooperative physical relationship. The specifications and claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

12. A combination is not rendered unpatentable by the existence of its various elements separately in the prior art. Bates v. Coe, 98 U.S. 31, 48 (1878); Imhaeuser v. Buerk, 101 U.S. 647, 660 (1880).

13. Anticipation is a technical defense which must meet strict standards. Unless all the same elements are found in substantially the same situation and united in the same way to perform the identical function in a single prior art reference, there is no anticipation. Continental Oil

Company v. Cole, 634 F.2d at 195; Hughes Tool Co. v. Ingersoll-Rand Co., 437 F.2d 1106, 1108 (5th Cir. 1971), cert. denied, 403 U.S. 918 (1976).

14. None of the prior art, including the Mayeaux experimental device and the multitudinous patents and publications, listed as Defendants' Exhibits 1-29, 39-45 and 52.64, combined the same elements of the Julien '858 patent in substantially the same situation so as to perform the unique functions of the Julien invention.

15. The defendants have not shown by clear and convincing evidence that the invention of the patent in suit was anticipated by any prior public use of sale. Barbed Wire Patent, 143 U.S. 275, 284 (1892); Southern Implement Manufacturing Co. v. McLemore, 350 F.2d 244, 249-50 (5th Cir. 1965).

16. Hence, Claims 1 through 10, being all of the claims of the Julien '858 patent

asserted in this litigation, are not anticipated by the prior art and are valid.

17. Infringement is the unauthorized making, using, or selling for use for profit of an invention covered by a valid claim of a patent during the line of the patent. 35 U.S.C. § 271.

18. Patents are to be liberally construed so as to uphold and not destroy the inventor's rights. Eibel Process Co. v. Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co., 261 U.S. 45, 63 (1923); Keystone Manufacturing Co. v. Adams, 151 U.S. 139, 144-145 (1894).

19. One form of infringement occurs when an accused device incorporates a teaching literally read. An infringement also occurs when a device appropriates a prior invention by incorporating its innovative concept and, albeit with some modifications and change, performs substantially the same function in substantially the same way to achieve substantially the same result. The

"doctrine of equivalents" shields the inventor from such abuse. Continental Oil Co. v. Cole, 434 F.2d at 191.

20. The determination of equivalency involves an examination of the scope of prior art, the essence or "heart" of the invention disclosed and the step forward the invention offers. Id.

21. Defendants have not actively infringed or otherwise induced infringement of the Julien 3,286,858 Patent either directly or indirectly.

22. The defendants' device is not the equivalent in function and operation of the Julien 3,286,858 Patent.

23. Upon a determination of validity, infringement, and enforceability, a patentee is entitled to an injunction when in accordance with the principles of equity, 35 U.S.C. § 238; Arthur J. Schmitt Foundation v. Stockham Values and Fittings, Inc., 292 F.Supp. 893 (N.D. Ala. 1966), aff'd., 404

F.2d 13 (5th Cir. 1968), cert. denied, 398 U.S. 965, 909 S. Ct. 2177, 25 L. Ed. 2d 549 (1970) . . . and, in the discretion of the Court in an exceptional case, to an award of reasonable attorneys fees, 35 U.S.C. § 285; Livesay Window Co., Inc. v. Livesay Industries, Inc., 251 F.2d 469 (5th Cir. 1958).

24. Plaintiff is not entitled to an aware of reasonable attorney's fees in the instant case.

25. Plaintiff is not entitled to recover damages.

26. Plaintiff is not entitled to recover costs.

27. No exceptional circumstance warrants an award of attorneys' fees, costs or expenses to the defendants in this case.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this 10th day of November, 1986.

/s/ Robert F. Collins
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

No. 88-2107

FILED
SEP 25 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

LEONARD J. JULIEN,

Petitioner,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY,

Respondents.

and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX,

Respondents.

On Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Federal Circuit

BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE AND JOHN CLET LANDRY IN OPPOSITION TO CERTIORARI

E. RICHARD ZAMECKI
BROWNING, BUSHMAN, ZAMECKI & ANDERSON
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77057
(713) 266-5593

Attorney for Respondents Henry Zeringue, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service and John Clet Landry

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The caption of the case contains the names of all the parties, except that the case against Labadieville Machinery Co., Inc. and its owner, Robert Boudreaux, was settled during trial.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

JUDGMENT, OPINIONS AND ORDER BELOW 1

CONTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

A. Some General History of the Case 2

B. Facts Regarding the Patent Case 3

C. Facts Regarding the Sanctions Case 4

ARGUMENT FOR DENYING THE WRIT 5

A. Regarding the Patent Case 5

B. Regarding the Sanctions Case 9

CONCLUSION 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Batson v. Neal Spelce Assoc., Inc., 765 F.2d 511 (5th Cir. 1985) 9

Graver Tank & Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Linde Air Products, Co., 336 U.S. 271, 93 L.Ed. 672 (1949) 6
On rehearing, 339 U.S. 605, 94 L.Ed. 1097 (1950) 6, 7, 8

Jones v. Continental Corp., 789 F.2d 1225 (6th Cir. 1986) 9, 10

Kanarek v. Hatch, 827 F.2d 1389 (9th Cir. 1987) 9

Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc., 833 F.2d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (in banc), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. ___ and ___, 99 L.Ed.2d 426 and 703 (1988) 9

Toombs v. Leone, Jr., 777 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1985) 10

Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. National Labor Relations Board, 809 F.2d 419 (7th Cir. 1987) 9

STATUTE

28 U.S.C. § 1927 ..... 9, 10

No. 88-2107

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

LEONARD J. JULIEN,

Petitioner,

v.

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY,

Respondents.

and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX,

Respondents.

On Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Federal Circuit

BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE AND JOHN CLET LANDRY IN OPPOSITION TO CERTIORARI

JUDGMENT, OPINIONS AND ORDER BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit regarding the patent case is reported at 864 F.2d

1569, and is copied in appendix A of the petition. The Federal Circuit's Order for sanctions against Petitioner Julien's counsel is reported at 864 F.2d 1572, and is copied in appendix B of the petition. The judgment and opinion of the District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in the patent case Civ. No. 82-0673, 83-2267 are copied at pages 5-45 in the "additional appendix" of the Petitioner.

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Some General History of the Case

Respondents Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service, Henry Zeringue and John Clet Landry (collectively "Zeringue") asserted at trial that all Claims 1-10 of the Julien patent-in-suit No. 3,286,858 were invalid over the prior art. The District Court held the claims to be valid, and held that Claims 1, 3 and 6-9, the only claims for which Petitioner Julien continued to allege infringement throughout the trial, were not infringed.

Julien appealed the holding of noninfringement to the Federal Circuit. Zeringue responded and cross-appealed the failure of the trial court to hold Claims 1-10 invalid and asserted that the appeal by Julien was frivolous, based on positions taken by Julien in his brief. Julien did not file a reply brief.

The Federal Circuit affirmed the district court's holding that Claims 1, 3 and 6-9 of the '858 patent were not infringed, but vacated the holding that Zeringue had not proven Claims 1-10 invalid, because the Federal Circuit

was affirming the holding on noninfringement and therefore not reaching the validity issue.

B. Facts Regarding the Patent Case

Patent No. 3,286,858, a copy of which is included in appendix H in the "supplemental appendix" of Julien, includes a single independent claim, which was amended during prosecution in the Patent and Trademark Office. At least ten limitations can be distinguished in Claim 1.

The claimed planter employs scissors grab devices, which open and close in a direction transverse to their line of travel, to pick up and carry cane along a straight line path, then drop the cane. The scissors grabs are illustrated in Figs. 2, 3 and 6 of the Julien patent. (pages (H)46-47 of the supplemental appendix) The first such scissors grab planter was designed and built by Mansel Mayeaux at Louisiana State University. The trial court found Mayeaux's scissors grab planter to be prior art to the Julien patent (finding of fact 30 and conclusion of law 14 of the trial court decision; pages 18, 19 and 42 of the additional appendix).

After sales of Julien's scissors grab planters ended, Zeringue's Farm Equipment Service began producing drum planters. Such planters do not employ scissors grabs, or the devices necessary to open and close the scissors grabs, nor the flexible means to move scissors grabs back and forth between a cane pick-up point and a cane release point, as claimed. Drum planters use rakes having no moving parts, mounted on the surface of a rotatable drum, to knock cane down off of the back of a planter's aid-type wagon.

References to the Zeringue rakes as "grabs" in the district court opinion were taken from pre-trial submissions on behalf of Julien. The trial court's findings of fact 26-29 and 32-42, relied on by the petition, do not make favorable comparisons between the accused planters and the '858 patent claims on which to base a finding of equivalence under the doctrine of equivalents. (additional appendix pages 16-18 and 20-24) Rather, as the Federal Circuit observed (petition appendix pages A-vi to A-viii), the trial court noted differences in at least the manner of operation of limitations of the claimed planter and features of the accused, including the claimed grab means, means to bias the grab means closed, and expander means to open the grab means at a cane pick-up point and at a cane release point at opposite ends of the sub-frame.

In findings of fact 48-81 (additional appendix pages 27-35), the trial court enumerated numerous claimed aspects which are not present in the accused planters, either literally or by equivalents. Finally, finding of fact 85 (additional appendix page 36) notes that the accused "structures are not equivalent to plaintiff's cane planter of Claims 1 through 10."

C. Facts Regarding the Sanctions Case

Facts regarding the sanctions are included in the Order of the Federal Circuit of January 5, 1989, at petition appendix pages B-iii to B-viii, and B-xiii to B-xvi.

In response to the order imposing sanctions, Julien's counsel submitted a twenty-six page combined motion for reconsideration and suggestion for rehearing *in banc*,

plus an appendix, and accompanied by six additional items, including 220 pages of deposition transcript.

The "pro bono" aspects of the case urged by the petition are misleading. Mr. Julien's counsel is not conducting this case on a pro bono basis. Julien's counsel has taken the case on the basis of one-third his "normal professional fee," plus "a reduced contingency fee interest," as noted on page 8 of his affidavit, appearing at page (K)67 of the supplemental appendix. A fee arrangement does not become pro bono because a client does not pay his bill, or because an attorney who takes a case on contingency does not win.

ARGUMENT FOR DENYING THE WRIT

A. Regarding the Patent Case

The trial court evaluated the claimed planter, compared the accused planters, and thereafter stated his findings based on this comparison. The trial court specifically noted the claimed features not found literally or by equivalents in the accused devices, and concluded with the finding that "Defendants' structures are not equivalent to plaintiff's cane planter of Claims 1-10." (additional appendix page 36)

The Federal Circuit noted that the trial court made extensive findings regarding noninfringement, and found that numerous claim limitations were not present in the accused planters. As an example, the Federal Circuit considered the trial court analysis of the structure and operation of the grab means, the means for biasing the grab

means closed, and the expander means on the sub-frame positioned to open the grab means at two points at opposite ends of the sub-frame. The differences in the structures, functions and operations of these features of the claim, contrasted to the structure, function and operation of the rakes of the accused planters, support the trial court's findings that such claimed features are neither literally or by equivalents found in the accused devices. The Federal Circuit noted that Julien failed to demonstrate that the trial court's findings are clearly erroneous. Since at least one claim limitation is missing from the accused planters, both literally and equivalently, the Federal Circuit agreed that there is no infringement. (petition appendix pages A-vi to A-viii)

This Court has noted that it " . . . cannot undertake to review concurrent findings of fact by two courts below in the absence of a very obvious and exceptional showing of error." (citations omitted) *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Linde Air Products Co.*, 336 U.S. 271, 275, 93 L.Ed. 672, 677 (1949). In that case, this Court found no cause for reversal of the affirmation by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit of the trial court's finding that the defendants " . . . made, . . . used and sold, a flux substantially identical with that set forth in the valid composition claims of the patent in suit." *Id.* at 276, 93 L.Ed. at 677.

This Court took the *Graver Tank* case up for rehearing on the sole issue of the infringement of four flux composition claims and the application of the doctrine of equivalents to the findings of fact in the case. *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. Inc. v. Linde Air Products Co.*, 339 U.S. 605, 606, 94 L.Ed. 1097, 1101 (1950). In discussing the early development of the doctrine of equivalents, this Court noted that

" . . . the doctrine was usually applied in cases involving devices where there was equivalence in mechanical *components* . . . ," and that subsequently the doctrine was " . . . also applied to compositions, where there was equivalence between chemical *ingredients*." *Id.* at 609, 94 L.Ed at 1102 (emphasis added). Again, at *Id.* 609-10, 94 L.Ed at 1103, this Court stated:

> Consideration must be given to the *purpose* for which an *ingredient* is used in a patent, the *qualities* it has when combined with the other ingredients, and the *function* which it is intended to perform.
>
> * * *
>
> A finding of equivalence is a determination of fact. . . . It is to be decided by the trial court and that court's decision, under general principles of appellate review, should not be disturbed unless clearly erroneous. (emphasis added).

This Court considered that the accused weld composition and the patented composition were " . . . identical in operation and produced the same kind and quality of weld." But, the issue to be resolved was whether the substitution for the claimed ingredient of an alkaline earth metal silicate, such as magnesium silicate, by the ingredient of manganese silicate in the accused composition (manganese not being an alkaline earth metal) was " . . . a change of such substance as to make the doctrine of equivalents inapplicable; or conversely, whether . . . the change was so insubstantial that the trial court's invocation of the doctrine of equivalents was justified." *Id.* at 610, 94 L.Ed. at 1103.

To consider this last condition, the Court acknowledged the evidence presented at trial and the trial court's finding, based on the evidence before him, that manganese silicate can be substituted for magnesium silicate in the welding composition. This Court found the trial court's conclusion to be not clearly erroneous. *Id.* at 610-12, 94 L.Ed. at 1103-04.

The *Graver Tank* case thus turned on whether a single claimed ingredient or element, not found literally in the accused composition, was present in the accused by a proper substitute ingredient so as to not substantially alter the operation of the composition. Does the substitute provide substantially the same work, way and result in the accused as the claimed ingredient in the claimed invention? This question regarding individual elements was answered for numerous claim limitations by the trial court in the present case, finding that no such equivalents existed between the features of the accused planters and the claimed planter elements. Thus, the accused planters do not, and could not, perform substantially the same work in substantially the same way as the claimed Julien planter.

Not only has Julien failed to show that the findings of fact of the trial court are clearly erroneous, as affirmed by the Federal Circuit, but Julien has urged, and continues to urge, that the claim limitations should somehow be ignored in the application of the doctrine of equivalents. No consideration of the Julien patent as an asserted "pioneer patent," or any of the reasons given for consideration of the petition can expand the scope of the claims beyond the restrictions imposed by file wrapper estoppel. Even without these restrictions, however, the operations,

functions and results provided by the claimed grab means and related components would still not be found in the accused planters, either identically or even substantially. The accused planters are simply not within the scope of the claims.

This Court has previously refused to hear the case of *Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc.*, 833 F.2d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (in banc), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. ___and___, 99 L.Ed.2d 426 and 703 (1988). The presence of a dissenting opinion in the case at the Federal Circuit level does not constitute a conflict among the "circuits" for this Court to resolve. The district court and the Federal Circuit in the present case followed this Court's decision in the *Graver Tank* case, and this present case is the only case at issue.

B. Regarding the Sanctions Case

The factual findings upon which sanctions are based are reviewable under the clearly erroneous standard. *Kanarek v. Hatch*, 827 F.2d 1389, 1391 (9th Cir. 1987). An award of attorney fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 is at the discretion of the court. *Jones v. Continental Corp.*, 789 F.2d 1225, 1229 (6th Cir. 1986) (citations omitted). Julien's counsel has not proven the factual findings to be in error, or that the court below abused its discretion, but rather has attempted to excuse his behavior. However, it is within the appeals court's discretion whether to accept the excuses or explanations for the conduct in question. *Batson v. Neal Spelce Assoc., Inc.*, 765 F.2d 511, 515 (5th Cir. 1985). The imposition of sanctions on Julien's counsel for his conduct in this case is not out of line. In *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. National Labor Relations Board*, 809 F.2d 419, 424-25 (7th

Cir. 1987), the Seventh Circuit imposed sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 on Westinghouse's lawyers for disobeying the Court's rule limiting the number of pages in their brief, even in the face of a denial of their motion to extend the brief, and for not properly meeting a subsequent requirement from the court to correct the brief.

In *Toombs v. Leone, Jr.*, 777 F.2d 465, 470-71 (9th Cir. 1985), Toombs' counsel was sanctioned by the trial court for filing a pre-trial brief and serving exhibit copies on the morning of the scheduled trial date, rather than no less than seven days earlier as required by the local rule. The sanctioned attorneys argued that they missed the deadline in order to produce a thorough and complete brief and set of exhibits. The Ninth Circuit, affirming the sanctions, observed that such "concern for thoroughness and completeness is not inconsistent with a finding of recklessness or bad faith." *Id.* at 471. Furthermore, an attorney can be sanctioned under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 for unreasonable and vexatious multiplication of litigation with no conscious impropriety on his part. *Jones v. Continental Corp., supra* at 1230.

Julien's counsel did receive due process in the imposition of sanctions against him. Upon receiving the order from the Federal Circuit directing him to serve a corrected brief and a table of appendix page numbers, Julien's counsel knew, or should have known, that his procedures for handling the appeal were not working properly. (petition appendix page B-v) The dismissal of the appeal due to his failure to timely file the appendix was further, clear notice to Julien's counsel that his conduct was under scrutiny. (petition appendix page B-vi) However, he continued to seek extensions of time from

the court. Finally, he filed an extensive motion for reconsideration of the dismissal, seeking to excuse his conduct of the appeal. (petition appendix pages B-vii and viii) After the order for sanctions was made, Julien's counsel again filed an extensive pleading to have the sanctions removed, as noted above.

Not only was Julien's counsel placed on notice that his conduct of the appeal was in trouble with the court, but he had ample opportunity to plead his case, and he did so, both before and after the order for sanctions.

CONCLUSION

The petition for writ sought by Julien should be denied.

Julien has simply failed to show on appeal that the trial court's findings of fact regarding noninfringement are in error, and misinterprets the doctrine of equivalents. There is no real disagreement among appeals courts pertinent to this issue for this Court to review, and the holding of the Federal Circuit regarding the infringement issue in this case is consistent with this Court's rule in the *Graver Tank* case.

Julien's counsel excuses and explains away his behavior in the appeal to the Federal Circuit, which that court found so offensive. However, the imposition of sanctions based on his conduct has not so far departed from the usual course of judicial proceedings as to call for

this Court to exercise its power of supervision. Furthermore, Julien's counsel was afforded due process, and extensively argued his position to the Federal Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

E. RICHARD ZAMECKI
BROWNING, BUSHMAN, ZAMECKI
& ANDERSON
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77057
(713) 266-5593

Attorney for Respondents
Henry Zeringue, Zeringue's Farm
Equipment Service and
John Clet Landry.

NO. 88-2107

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 25 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1989

LEONARD J. JULIEN,

Petitioner.

versus

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY; and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION OF THOMSON INTERNATIONAL CO.

JOHN M. COMAN, JR.
812 Gravier Street
1006 Hibernia Bank Bldg.
New Orleans, La. 70112
(504) 523-4737

Attorney for Respondent

A B Letter Service, Inc., 327 Chartres St., New Orleans, La. (504) 581-5555

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii
CASES ii
STATUTES AND RULES ii

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2
The Doctrine of Equivalents
(*Pennwalt*) 2
The Doctrine of Equivalents
(*Gravier*) 4
Julien's Doctrine of
Equivalents 5
Sanctions Against Counsel 6

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 6

CONCLUSION 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES: **Page**

D.M.I., Inc. v. Deere & Co.
755 F.2d 1570, 225 USPQ 236 Fed. Cir. 1985) 2

Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.
339 U.S. 605, 85 USPQ 328 (1950) 2

Hughes Aircraft Co. v. United States
717 F.2d 1351, 219 USPQ 473 (Fed.Cir. 1983).....2

Lemelson v. United States
752 F.2d 1538, 1551, 224 USPQ 526, 533 (Fed.Cir. 1985) 3

Martin V. Barber
755 F.2d 1564, 225 USPQ 233 (Fed.Cir. 1985).....2

Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc.
833 F.2d 931, 934-35, 4 USPQ 2d 1737, 1739-40 (Fed.Cir. 1987) (in banc), Cert. denied, 108 S.Ct. 1226 and 1474 (1988) 2,3

STATUTES AND RULES:

28 U.S.C. 1927 6

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1989

No. 88-2107

LEONARD J. JULIEN,

Petitioner.

versus

HENRY ZERINGUE, ZERINGUE'S FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE and JOHN CLET LANDRY; and

THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC., LABADIEVILLE MACHINERY CO., INC., and ROBERT BOUDREAUX,

Respondents.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION OF THOMSON INTERNATIONAL CO.

The plaintiff filed suit against the defendants alleging their sugar cane planters infringed his patent.

The Trial Court held there was no infringement under the doctrine of equivalents by the accused devices of defendants.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit basically affirmed the lower court's judgment. Additionally, the Federal Circuit sanctioned Appellant's Counsel under 28 U.S.C. 1927.

Mr. Leonard Julien then filed a Petition for a Writ of Centiorari.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- The Doctrine of Equivalents (Pennwalt) -

The lower court enunciated thirty-four (34) distinctive elements in Julien's claim which were not, nor their equivalent, present in the Thomson rotary drum planter. (TC's FF 48-82; Appen. G, pp. 13-18).

Julien argues that this "claim limitation" or "element-by-element" approach for the doctrine of equivalents is erroneous as a matter of law.

To support his position, Julien relies on the cases of *Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co., Inc. v. Linde Air Products,* 339 U.S. 605, 85 USPQ 328 (1950), *Martin v. Barber,* 755 F2d 1564, 225 USPQ 233 (Fed.Cir. 1985), *D.M.I., Inc. v. Deere & Co.,* 755 F2d 1570, 225 USPQ 236 (Fed.Cir. 1985), and *Hughes Aircraft Co., v. United States,* 717 F2d 1351, 219 USPQ 473 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Julien argues that the above cases hold that the "invention-as-a-whole" approach is appropriate in applying the doctrine of equivalents.

However, this exact issue was directly addressed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in its decision of January 5, 1989 (CAFC OP. 4, Appen. A):

> If a claim limitation or its substantial equivalent is not present, there can be no infringement. *Pennwalt Corp. v. Durand-Wayland, Inc.,* 833 F.2d 931, 934-35, 4 USPQ 2d 1737, 1939-40

(Fed.Cir. 1987) (in banc), *cert. denied*, 108 S.Ct. 1226 and 1474 (1988); *Lemelson v. United States*, 752 F2d 1538, 1551, 224 USPQ 526, 533 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

The CAFC did not erroneously misapply the doctrine of equivalents. The CAFC correctly held that the claim limitation approach is valid. The Court must compare each element of the claim with the accused device to determine whether the accused device contains each claim element or its substantial equivalent.

This is the *Pennwalt* precedent, which reiterated long standing infringement analysis case law.

Pennwalt is not an "unfortunate divergence."

Patents are necessary to protect the inventor who expends his time and money to advance an innovative concept.

However, a patent is a limited right.

The holder of a patent does not have the right to expand the elements of his claim to include non-equivalent elements. The different elements and operations of the accused device must be the equivalent of those elements disclosed in the patent. If not, there is no infringement.

The entire claim must be scrutinized. Every element (or combination of elements), or its substantial equivalent in the accused device must be present in the claim.

In *Pennwalt*, Judge Nies, in his "Additional View," produced a scholarly dissertation in his infringment analysis, including cases of the United States Supreme

Court, the Court of Claim' cases, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's cases.

Judge Nies concluded that the Courts must "look at each element of the claim, that is, proceed through the claim element-by-element, and look for correspondence in the allegedly infringing device."

Therefore, the CAFC was not erroneous, as a matter of law, in upholding the Trial Court's element-by-element approach of the doctrine of equivalents.

- The Doctrine of Equivalents (*Graver)* -

Assuming arguendo, that the Graver application of the doctrine of equivalents is adopted, the results would not change.

Under *Graver,* for infringement, an accused device, as a whole, would have to perform substantially the same overall function or work in substantially the same way to obtain substantially the same overall result as the claimed invention.

The Julien planter requires cane grabs to open and close in some manner, thereby picking up and carrying the cane from the wagon to the trough.

The Zeringue and Thomson planters use "w" shaped rakes that stab, rake or sweep the cane down into the trough.

The rakes do not perform substantially the same overall function or work in substantially the same way to obtain substantially the same overall result as the Julien mechanical fingers.

Judge Collins held this in his Findings of Facts (TC's FF 456, 57, 58, 59, 60 and 61; Appen. G, pp. 14-15).

The CAFC affirmed this Finding when it pronounced:

> Julien has failed to convince us that the district court's findings are clearly erroneous.
>
> (CAFC OP. 4-5, Appen. A)

Mr. Julien did not obtain the first cane planter patent. However, his mechanical fingers on a planter were novel. Likewise, the rotary drum, push-gate and "w" shaped rakes of the Zeringue and Thomson planters were novel.

- Julien's Doctrine of Equivalents -

Although Julien promotes the doctrine of equivalents as expressed in *Graver,* his Petition For A Writ of Centiorari is void of specifics demonstrating how the accused planters perform substantially the same overall function or work in substantially the same way to obtain substantially the same overall result as the Julien planter.

The sole exception is that Julien, in his Writ of Centiorari, mentions that the Trial Court called defendants' cane engaging means "grabs" on eight occasions. (See Julien Brief, p. 5)

However, the Trial Court and the CAFC found defendant's cane engaging means to be rakes with rake functions, and not grabs with grab functions. A broom may be called a vacuum cleaner a hundred times, but this will never create a vacuum function in the broom.

- Sanctions Against Counsel -

The CAFC properly imposed sanctions against counsel as per its authority under 28 U.S.C. 1927.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The CAFC properly applied the doctrine of equivalents as confirmed in *Pennwalt.* Through the claim limitation or element-by-element approach, there is no infringement.

In the alternative, even if *Graver* was applied, and the accused device and the claimed invention were "viewed as a whole," there is still no infringement. The two planters do not perform the same overall function or work in substantially the same way.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, a writ of centiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted:

John M. Coman, Jr.

JOHN M. COMAN, JR.
812 Gravier Street
1006 Hibernia Bank Bldg.
New Orleans, LA 70112-1406
(504) 523-4737

Attorney for Respondent